

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

# The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 58, St. Albans Road, Edinburgh.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

## Board of Management:

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., *Chairman.*

Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*

L. WHIBLEY, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, *With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.*  
Litt.D., F.B.A.  
Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A.

E. A. BARBER, M.A., *representing the Oxford Philological Society.*  
Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., *representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. RITCHE, University of Cape Town.

Vol. XLIV

SEPTEMBER, 1930

No. 4

## CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS .. .. .	113	REVIEWS (continued):	
PLATO, <i>Theaetetus</i> 209D. F. M. CORNFORD.	114	<i>The Great Writers of Rome</i> (Conway). J. WIGHT DUFF .. .. .	131
DRAUCUS AND MARTIAL XI 8 I. A. E. HOUSMAN .. .. .	114	<i>César, Guerre des Gaules</i> (Constans). L. J. D. RICHARDSON .. .. .	132
SOPHOCLES, <i>Antigone</i> , 1302 3. J. U. POWELL .. .. .	116	<i>Titì Livi Ab Urbe Condita</i> , III. (Walters and Conway). E. E. GENNER .. .. .	134
PLATO, <i>Epistle</i> VI. 322D. L. A. POST .. .. .	116	<i>Lucain. II</i> (Bourgery and Ponchont). A. E. HOUSMAN .. .. .	136
CICERO, <i>Epist.</i> XI. 27, § 7. A. SOUTER .. .. .	116	<i>Sénèque: Questions Naturelles</i> (Oltremare); <i>Die Nachahmungstechnik Senecas</i> (Kapnukajas). G. B. A. FLETCHER .. .. .	137
STATIUS, <i>Silvae</i> IV. 3. 48. A. SOUTER .. .. .	116	<i>The Greek Fathers</i> (Campbell). E. W. WATSON .. .. .	139
TACITUS, <i>Histories</i> I. 42. H. HILL .. .. .	117	Some Class-Books. H. WILLIAMSON .. .. .	139
TACITUS, <i>Hist.</i> I. 22. 1. H. C. NUTTING .. .. .	117	<i>A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome</i> (Platner and Ashby); <i>Undersökningar i Roms Topografi</i> (Lundström). R. GARDNER .. .. .	142
TACITUS, <i>Agr.</i> 9. 3. H. C. NUTTING .. .. .	118	Recent Compositions and Translations. S. GASELEE .. .. .	144
REVIEWS:		Some Verse Translations. E. S. FORSTER .. .. .	146
<i>The Composition of Homer's Odyssey</i> (Woodhouse). G. MURRAY .. .. .	118	<i>Beknopt Latijnsch - Nederlandsch Woordenboek</i> (Muller and Renkema). A. SOUTER .. .. .	147
<i>Homer, Dichtung und Sage</i> , II. (Bethe). H. L. LORIMER .. .. .	119	SHORT REVIEWS .. .. .	148
<i>Untersuchungen zum Gefesselten Prometheus</i> (Schmid). J. R. BACON .. .. .	121	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS .. .. .	155
<i>Thucydides and the Science of History</i> (Cochrane). A. W. GOMME .. .. .	123	BOOKS RECEIVED .. .. .	157
<i>Xenophon's Historia Graeca</i> (Hude). E. C. MARCHANT .. .. .	124		
<i>Classical Studies</i> (Sargeant); <i>Essays and Addresses</i> (Burnet). R. W. LIVINGSTONE .. .. .	125		
<i>Plato, with an English Translation</i> , VII. (Bury). A. E. TAYLOR .. .. .	127		
<i>The Greek City and its Institutions</i> (Glotz). M. CARY .. .. .	130		

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present Number, 2s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3 Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. F. Hose, Dulwich College, S.E. 21; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Dr. E. Norman Gardiner, 1, Linton Road, Oxford, and Miss E. C. Gedge, Crayford Rectory, Kent; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. W. Beare, The University, Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, 42, Lordswood Road, Harborne, Birmingham; Mr. R. B. Onians, 35, Mount Street, Liverpool; Professor F. S. Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. W. L. Cuttle, The University, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. J. Vaughan, University College, W.C. 1; Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, Fernshaw, Hilary Road, Llanishen, Cardiff; Mr. D. E. F. Binyon, The University, Leeds; Miss A. I. S. Smith, Girls' Grammar School, Bradford; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss M. M. Towne, County School for Girls, Beckenham; Mr. T. B. L. Webster, Christ Church, Oxford; Miss C. Keith, St. Hilda's College, Oxford; Miss W. A. Odell, Brighton and Hove High School for Girls, Brighton; Mrs. F. G. Maunsell, 123, University Road, Southampton; Professor F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; Dr. G. H. Goldsmith, 6, Bromham Road, Bedford; Mr. J. E. Scott, Caius College, Cambridge; Miss N. C. Jolliffe, The University, Reading; Mr. G. H. P. P. Tredennick, 34, Beech Hill Road, Sheffield; Mr. H. Hill, University College, Swansea; and Mr. R. Dobbin, 326, Montreal Street, Christchurch, New Zealand. It is hoped to form a branch at Leicester; anyone interested should apply to Mr. P. Leon, University College, Leicester.

### A CLASSICAL DICTIONARY

OF

GREEK & ROMAN BIOGRAPHY  
MYTHOLOGY & GEOGRAPHY

Compiled from Sir Wm. Smith's  
larger Dictionaries, Revised by  
G. E. Marindin, M.A. With over  
800 woodcuts. Demy 8vo. 21s. net.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE ST., W. 1

### BOOKS

FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND

CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

J. POOLE & CO.

86 CHARING CROSS ROAD  
LONDON, W.C. 2.

d  
n  
al  
to  
te

al  
s.  
gs  
al  
al  
re  
st

ne  
er  
d,  
ry  
y,  
n;  
er-  
sil  
iss  
w,  
ls;  
ns,  
or;  
L.  
rd;  
on;  
er,  
rd;  
ity,  
H.  
eet,  
one

S

D





# The Classical Review

SEPTEMBER, 1930

## NOTES AND NEWS

High Heaven rejects the lore  
Of nicely-calculated less and more.

Last February the *C.R.* published a demonstration that the two-thousandth anniversary of the birth of Virgil falls on October 15, 1931; but, whether because men of letters are bad at numbers, or because Parnassian time (who knows?) may reckon with a B.C. 0, it is on the Ides of this October that bimillenary homage will be paid.

Meanwhile the presses of Europe and America are busy with Virgilian books. Whosoever shall not have written one by the Ides, let him consecrate that day to reading Virgil; and, having read, the veriest precisian in arithmetic can utter his prayer: *INCIPIAT FELICITER ANNVS VERGILI BIS MILLESIMVS.*

From Mr. W. Beare:

'At a time like the present, when Vergilian studies are much to the fore, it may be worth while to draw the attention of scholars to the sumptuous facsimile edition of the great Ambrosian Codex, which has just been published by the firm of Ulrico Hoepli under the joint auspices of the Ambrosian Library and the University of Milan. Both the publisher and the editors (Sabbadini and others) deserve warm congratulations for the excellence of this magnificent volume, which the present writer has been enabled to examine by the kindness of Professor Rébora, of the University of Manchester.

'The romantic history of the manuscript, the great names which have been associated with it (from Petrarch to the present Pope), and the beauty of Simone Martini's allegorical miniatures, combine to make this reproduction one of special interest. The text itself, with its numerous marginal notes, has never been fully collated. Yet it must be of real value, if only as presenting to us the vulgate of Vergil as established in the thirteenth century. In addition to the Eclogues, Georgics and Aeneid, it

contains the Achilleid of Statius and a few odes of Horace, as well as copious grammatical commentaries.

'The limited edition of 300 copies is at present being issued to subscribers at the price of 1500 lire; later the cost will be 2000 lire.'

An invitation has been received by the Classical Association from the Classical Association of South Africa to take part in a meeting which it is proposed to hold in August, 1931. Meetings would be held in Cape Town and in Johannesburg, and visitors would be given an opportunity to see the Victoria Falls. Special return fares by Union Castle mail steamer can be secured by a party of at least forty members. It is unnecessary to emphasize the interest and importance of this project, and those who are in a position to think and act imperially will be supplied with information by either of the Secretaries, Miss E. C. Gedge and Dr. E. N. Gardiner.

Cambridge has recently received large benefactions for the building of a new University Library and for the development of certain sciences. If anyone had feared lest the just balance of studies should be disturbed by hypertrophy of the scientific side of the University's work, his misgivings will have been set at rest by the announcement of the will of the Honourable Sir Perceval Maitland Laurence, LL.D., who died on the last day of February. 'I hereby constitute and appoint as my residuary legatees the Chancellor Masters and Scholars of the University of Cambridge to whom I give and bequeath the residue of my estate in token of my affection as an alumnus of that great University and in recognition of the extent to which any success I may have attained in life is attributable to its educative influence in the broadest sense.' A fifth of the bequest is for the

benefit of the University Library: the remainder is to be 'devoted to the promotion of the studies of Classics Ancient History Philosophy and Archaeology.' The residue of the estate is estimated at £150,000.

A new and important annual made its first appearance last April: *Supplément critique au Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, I, Année 1929. Each volume is to deal with the books of the year previous to its publication; the reviews are to be unsigned; and some pages at the end will be reserved for

replies from French scholars to criticisms of their work which have appeared elsewhere. The first volume, of 190 large pages, goes back a little beyond 1928, and, as was natural at the outset, not all the books of 1928 that most deserved notice were to hand. About seventy books and articles are reviewed, and a specimen of the retort courteous is given by nine pages at the end in which M. Chambry replies to critics of his work on Aesop. The whole book is excellent in matter and in manner, and the series which begins with it promises to be a valuable organ of scholarship.

#### PLATO, THEAETETUS 209D.

ΣΩ. τὸ οὖν προσλαβεῖν λόγον τῇ ὀρθῇ δόξῃ τί ἂν ἐτι εἴη; εἰ μὲν γὰρ προσδοξάσαι λέγει ἢ διαφέρει τι τῶν ἄλλων, πάνυ γελοία γίνεταί ἡ ἐπιταξίς.

ΘΕ. πῶς;

ΣΩ. ὡς ὀρθὴν δόξαν ἔχομεν ἢ τῶν ἄλλων διαφέρει, τούτων προσλαβεῖν κελεύει ἡμᾶς ὀρθὴν δόξαν ἢ τῶν ἄλλων διαφέρει . . .

ΘΕ. φεῖ γε δὴ (B. εἰπέ δὴ T.) τί νυνδὴ ὡς ἐρῶν ἐπύθου; ΣΩ. εἰ τὸ λόγον, ὦ παῖ, προσλαβεῖν γινώσκει κελεύει, ἀλλὰ μὴ δοξάσαι τὴν διαφορότητα, κτλ.

THE objection to reading εἰπέ δὴ τί νυνδὴ ὡς ἐρῶν ἐπύθου; (with Burnet and others) is that Socrates' last question (τὸ οὖν προσλαβεῖν . . . εἴη;) did not suggest that he had something more to say. What did suggest this was the εἰ μὲν, implying that an alternative supposition (εἰ δέ) was to follow—the supposition stated in the last sentence above quoted. Badham saw this, and attempted to restore the necessary sense to Theaetetus' inquiry by reading εἰ δέ γε—τί νυνδὴ ὡς ἕτερον ὑπέθου; 'Whereas if—what was it you suggested just now as the alternative?' The sense is right, if it could be got out of the words. But (as Campbell observed) ὑποτίθεσθαι, though it can

mean to put an explicit suggestion to a person, cannot mean to imply something not stated at all; and the imperfect would be required.

I propose to keep Badham's ὑπέθου in its common sense of 'you made a supposition' (viz. the εἰ μὲν sentence) and to read: εἰ δέ γε—τί νυνδὴ ὡς ἐρῶν <ἔτι> ὑπέθου; 'Whereas if—what was it (the "whereas if") that your supposition just now implied (ὡς) that you were going on to state?' For εἰπεῖν ἐτι cf. Soph. O.T. 748 δέλξεις δὲ μᾶλλον, ἣν ἐν ἐξείπης ἐτι. Theaetetus elsewhere prompts Socrates: 207A ΘΕ. οἶον τί λέγεις; ΣΩ. οἶον καὶ Ἡσίοδος . . . 'As for example—what do you mean?' 'As, for example, Hesiod . . .'; and again at 208c. ΕΤΙΤΗΘΟΤ might easily be wrongly corrected to ΕΠΙΤΗΘΟΤ.

The εἰπέ δὴ of T. looks like a too obvious correction of εἰ γε δὴ, probably itself due to someone who did not see that the construction of Theaetetus' sentence is broken.

F. M. CORNFORD.

#### DRAUCUS AND MARTIAL XI 8 1.

THE definitions of *draucus* in Forcelini and Freund and Georges and Lewis and Short may best be described as lurid moonshine; and the care of Benoist and Goelzer to conceal the very existence of the word from the Gallic nation reminds one of Miss Prism superintending Cecily Cardew's

study of political economy and directing her to omit the chapter on the Fall of the Rupee. There ought surely to have been similar silence for the French and similar misinformation for the rest of us on an earlier page: 'comoedus, i, m., moechus, Iuu. VI 73 soluitur his magno comoedi fibula

(379 sq. si gaudet cantu, nullius fibula durat | uocem uendentis praetoribus), Mart. XIV 215 dic mihi simpliciter, comoedis et citharoedis, | fibula, quid praestas? carius ut futuant.' *Draucus* is as innocent a word as *comoedus*, and simply means one who performs feats of strength in public. In two passages no other interpretation is possible<sup>1</sup>: Mart. VII 67 4-6 'harpasto quoque subligata ludit | et flauescit haphe grauesque draucis | halteras facili rotat lacerto', XIV 48 'HARPASTA. haec rapit Antaei uelox in puluere draucus, | grandia qui uano colla labore facit.' But partly because of the common though false opinion that muscular strength and sexual vigour go together, and partly because these men, being *infibulati* to prevent them from impairing their stamina, might be expected, when *refibulati*, to exhibit ardour, they were also in request for another purpose and could now and then earn pocket-money in their spare time. This, nothing more, is signified by Mart. I 96 12, IX 27 10, XI 72 1. The old citation 'gloss. Philox. draucus καταπύγων' has prudently been dropped by Georges, for the MSS have 'depugis',—not to mention that *καταπύγων* means exactly the opposite of what *draucus* is supposed to mean; and it is hardly worth relating that *draucus* has been conjectured for *raucus* in Iuu. XI 157.

But neither with its true nor with its imaginary meaning can this word maintain itself in Mart. XI 8 1. Its incongruousness in the one sense and its hideous incongruousness in the other cannot fully be displayed without printing the greater part of the poem.

lassa quod hesterni spirant opobalsama drauci,  
ultima quod curuo quae cadit aura croco,  
poma quod hiberna maturescentia capsae,  
arbore quod uerna luxuriosus ager,  
5 de Palatinis dominae quod serica prelis,  
sucia uirginea quod regelata manu,  
amphora quod nigri, sed longe, fracta Falerni,  
quod qui Sicani detinet hortus apes,  
quod Cosmi redolent alabastra focique deorum,

<sup>1</sup> I spoke in haste: all things are possible. In Pauly-Wissowa VII p. 2407 the genitive *Antaei* is detached from *puluere* and attached to *draucus*, 'der Liebhaber des Antäus.'

10 quod modo diuitibus lapsa corona comis:  
singula quid dicam? non sunt satis: omnia misce,  
hoc fragrant pueri basia mane mei.

In all Martial there are no verses of more choice and elaborate refinement. The image, in such a poem, of an *hesternus draucus*, supposed to mean 'qui heri pathicum subegit', was naturally revolting to Gronovius and is not suffered to pollute the text of Schneidewin, Friedlaender, Gilbert, or Mr. Duff. Two editors of our golden age retain it, and without an obelus; for if conservative critics had not strong stomachs they would not be conservative critics.

Gronovius found in an interpolated MS the reading

*lapsa quod externis spirant opobalsama truncis,*

and recommended it in a learned note, *diatr.* c. XVI, pp. 165 f. ed. Hand. The words *lapsus* and *lassus*, *externus* and *hesternus*, are much confused, and balsam is in fact the exudation of a shrub foreign to Italy. The conjecture nevertheless is false, and neither *lassa* nor *hesterni* can be altered: they harmonise too perfectly with the 'ultima . . . aura' of 2 and the *longe* (spirat) of 7, all three verses suggesting a faint waft of distant or evanescent fragrance.

I have known for years and years that *drauci* is here a corruption of the name of some vessel used for holding the unguent; but probably I should never have discovered the name itself if it were not for the 9th edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek lexicon. It is *dracti*. Information about this word will be found in Dittenberger's *Orientis Graecae inscriptiones selectae* vol. II p. 83, where seven examples of it are collected from inscriptions: for instance *θεῖς δρακτῆ τὸ ἐλαιον* and *ἀλείψασαν δις δρακτοῖς καὶ ἐπιρῦτοις* and *ἐλαία δρακτοῖς πολλάκις τεθεικότα*. Other Greek words used by Martial and, so far as can be learnt from the dictionaries, by no other Latin author are *ascaules*, *chersos*, *copta*, *eschatocollion*, *gelasinus*, *hexaclinon*, *ophthalmicus*, *orthopygium*, *pityon*.

It will not be out of place to add that the obscene sense discovered by lexicographers and editors in *strangulare*

at Cic. *fam.* IX 22 4 is another hallucination. What Cicero says is that we are absurd in treating parricide as more mentionable than sexual intercourse, not that *strangulare* was ever used in

the latter connexion. The text (*aliquid*) actually forbids that interpretation; and it has therefore lately been proposed to alter it.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

SOPHOCLES, *ANTIGONE*, 1802-3.

καύσασα μὲν  
τοῦ πρὶν θανόντος Μεγαρέως κενὸν λέχος

is the text given here by Mr. Pearson, following Seyffert: MSS. κλεινὸν λέχος. He has argued forcibly in the *Classical Quarterly* XXII. 190, that the context demands the meaning which is given by κενὸν λέχος, but he arrives at his text by a long road: κενὸν wrongly written καινόν, corrupted in its turn to the vox nihili κλινόν, which was corrected to κλεινόν. Perhaps we should read κεινόν, even though the metre does not demand it. The corruption of κεινόν to κλεινόν may be illustrated by the places in the MSS. of Sophocles where a letter is intruded into a word: *Oed. Tyr.* 1355 ἄχθος for ἄχος in L; *Ajax* 1214 ἀγκείται for ἀνείται, in L; *Oed. Col.* 1199 βλαία for βαία, in all MSS.; so *Oed. Tyr.* 1360 ἄθλιος MSS., where all editors require ἄθεος, *Antig.* 1037 τὰ πρὸ (or τὸν πρὸς) MSS. for τὰπὸ Σάρδεων which editors now require. Generally the change is from a less familiar word to a more familiar, as here. This Ionic form is preserved by MSS. in *Trachiniae* 495, where editors print ὥς . . . | καὶ ταῦτ' ἄγης· κενὸν γὰρ οὐ δικάϊα σε | χωρεῖν, but where L gives κείνον and A κεινόν, while κενὸν has only late authority. There, too, the metre does not demand κενόν.

So in *Oed. Col.* 928 ξείνον παρ' ἀστοῖς ὥς διατᾶσθαι χρεὼν is given by L and A, ξένον appearing only in Vat. (*Palat.* 287); just as in Eurip. *Iph. Tau.* 798 L and P give ξείν', οὐ δικαίως τῆς θεοῦ τὴν πρόσπολον | χραίνεις. Yet in both places the recent editors reject the well-supported Ionic form.

J. U. POWELL.

St. John's College,  
Oxford.

PLATO, *EPISTLE* VI. 322D.

Ἐρδσθ' ὃ καὶ Κορίσκῳ, πρὸς τῇ τῶν εἰδῶν σοφίᾳ τῇ καλῇ ταύτῃ, φήμ' ἐγώ, καίπερ γέρων ὢν, προσδεῖν σοφίας τῆς περὶ τοὺς πονηροὺς καὶ ἀδίκους φυλακτικῆς καὶ τινοῦ ἀμυντικῆς δυνάμεως.

THE expression καίπερ γέρων ὢν has been a stumbling-block both to advocates of the genuineness of the sixth epistle and to others who attempted seriously to explain it. It becomes clear directly we interpret it as a reminiscence of Sophocles' *Thyestes*, fragment 239 (Nauck):

καίπερ γέρων ὢν· ἀλλὰ τῷ γήρῳ φιλεῖ  
χὼ νοὺς ὁμαρτεῖν καὶ τὸ βουλευεῖν ἂν δεῖ.

The writer of the epistle assumed that his readers would supply the remainder of a familiar quotation of which he gave the first words. There are unannounced quotations

from Homer in *Ep.* VII. 344D and 345E. Poetic reminiscences are fairly frequent in Plato. At *Laws* 705A there is a reminiscence of Alcman.

L. A. POST.

Haverford College, U.S.A.

CICERO, *EPIST.* XI. 27, § 7.

'Ea tu si non audis, quid dicam nescio; equidem, siquando audio, tam defendo quam me scio a te contra *iniquus* meos solere defendi. Defensio autem est duplex; alia sunt quae *liquido* negare soleam, ut de isto ipso suffragio, alia quae defendam a te pie fieri et humane, ut de curatione ludorum.'

SUCH is the text as printed by Purser and by Sjögren. But in spite of the parallels for substantival *iniquus* with a pronominal adjective produced from the manuscript text of the *Pro Plancio*, §§ 40, 57, as by How, it seems probable that we should read *inimicos* here. It is not necessary to suppose that the error goes back to a wrong expansion of shorthand in Cicero's autograph. The equation *c=qu* is found in many MSS., though especially in those of Spanish origin, and the use of the short cross-stroke above the line for *m* would make the two words practically identical: *inicos, inicos*.

The *liquido* of editors is an emendation of the MSS. *aliquido, aliquando*. I have little hesitation in preferring *ad liquidum*. It is true that this adverbial expression is not cited from Cicero, but it occurs in Livy, Curtius, Quintilian, Ambrosiaster (where one MS. reads *alliquidum*), and perhaps elsewhere.

A. SOUTER.

The University, Aberdeen.

STATIUS, *SILVAE* IV. 3, 48.

Et crebris iter alligare *gomfis*.

THE line is thus printed in Klotz's second edition (1911): in Vollmer's (1898) and in Phillimore's second edition (1917) the last word is printed *gomphis*. All editors appear to have deserted the sole authoritative MS., the Madrid manuscript of the early part of the fifteenth century, with the view of transliterating the only then known form of the Greek word γόμφος as accurately as possible. The Madrid manuscript, as a matter of fact, reads *gomfis*, and that this form should have been kept by the editors is suggested by the evidence of four out of eight places in which the word is found in the Greek inscriptions of Epidaurus, as recently edited by F. Hiller von Gaertringen.<sup>1</sup> For in four places

<sup>1</sup> *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Vol. IV., ed. min. fasc. primus (Berol. 1929).



the word is spelt γόνφος, not γόμφος, as it is in the remaining four. The inscriptions in which the form γόνφος occurs are of the fourth century B.C., to which period the other inscriptions also belong. In the same way also γύμφη occurs sometimes in Anatolian inscriptions for the usual γύμνη. The combination -mf- is hardly known in pure Latin words outside the word *amfractus*, and the other form *anfractus* is much oftener given by the manuscripts: -mph- in Latin seems to come only from Greek, of course, for *lymphā* appears to be only an apparent exception.

The matter here discussed is perhaps of slight importance, but it is reassuring to find that this late Latin MS. is right after all.

A. SOUTER.

*The University, Aberdeen.*

#### TACITUS, HISTORIES I. 42.

'Quod seu finxit formidine seu conscientia(m) coniurationis confessus est . . .'

EDITORS here vary between *conscientia*, Ablative parallel with *formidine*, and *conscientiam*, Accusative dependent on *confessus est*, but the majority favour the Accusative, and Spooner goes so far as to say that the Ablative is almost nonsense. Yet *conscientia* is the manuscript reading and has other points in its favour.

In the first place it does not seem to have been noticed that we have here a case of Chiasmus, a figure of which Tacitus is very fond. In his dissertation on the subject, R. B. Steele states that there are in Tacitus 318 examples of Chiasmus between pairs of verbs and nouns. Of these forty have the nouns in the Ablative, and of the forty only six have the verbs together. We have therefore thirty-four examples of Chiasmus precisely similar to the MS. reading here. Moreover, it is rare to find Chiasmus in which the grammatical structure of the two halves is different, and Steele does not record one such passage among our thirty-four. These facts in themselves are almost conclusive evidence in favour of the Ablative.<sup>1</sup>

To this we must add that the natural object of both *finxit* and *confessus est*, according to the order, is *quod*, and to supply another object for *confessus est* by reading *conscientiam* spoils the balance of the sentence.<sup>2</sup> This reading, of course, is due to the difficulty which editors seem to find in interpreting the Ablative, but this seems to me perfectly clear. *Quod* refers to the statement of Vinius 'non esse ab Othone mandatum ut occideretur.' Tacitus is laying stress on the antithesis between *finxit*, invention of falsehood, and *confessus est*, confession of the truth. If this statement was false, he says, it was an invention due to fear, but if it

was true it amounted to a confession of complicity in the plot against Galba, and of the two alternatives Tacitus prefers the latter. By reading *professus est*, which Ritter thought was necessary to the sense, we should greatly weaken this antithesis and rob the sentence of its Tacitean fulness of meaning. It is not easy to reproduce this sentence adequately in English, but we may perhaps translate: 'Whether this statement was an invention due to fear or a confession (of complicity with Otho) due to his being privy to the plot, Vinius' character and mode of life favour the latter view.'

H. HILL.

*University College, Swansea.*

#### TACITUS, HIST. I. 22. 1.

'Et intimi libertorum servorumque, corruptius quam in privata domo habiti . . . exprobrabant.'

THE general sense of the phrase *corruptius quam in privata domo* is clear, namely that unbridled licence ruled in Otho's home before his elevation to the principate. More or less similar turns are found in three other passages in the *Histories*:

III. 7. 2: *adductus quam civili bello imperitabat.*

III. 40. 1: *segniùs quam ad bellum incendens.*

III. 53. 2: *litteras . . . composuit iactantius quam ad principem.*

There has been a strong tendency to interpret these expressions in terms of *quam pro*. See Heraeus on I. 22. 1 and III. 53. 2; and Moore's note on the former passage runs: '*quam in*; an innovation for *quam pro*.'

Obviously it would be difficult to apply such interpretation to III. 53. 2 in particular; and it seems strange that attention is not called to the fact that these comparatives with *quam* are quite on the same footing as certain other comparatives with the ablative, e.g. Juvenal 15. 139 ff.: '*infans et minor igne rogi*.' It is customary here to render 'too small for,' but a more literal translation would be 'smaller than (befits) the funeral pyre,' with recognition of brachylogy remotely analogous to that of the familiar '*comparatio compendiaria*.' So with the examples above cited in which the *quam*-construction is used: Otho's household is conducted with greater laxity than (befitting) in the establishment of a subject, the camp-prefect holds a tighter rein than (befitting) in a time of civil war, etc.

The use of the *quam*-construction (rather than the ablative) with comparative adverbs is normal; and it is forced, when prepositional phrases such as *in privata domo* and *ad principem* are to follow; otherwise these examples seem quite on a par with *minor igne rogi* and the like. Wolff's notes on III. 7. 2 and III. 53. 2 contain suggestions looking in the direction of the interpretation here proposed; but they fail to make the necessary connections.

H. C. NUTTING.

*University of California.*

<sup>1</sup> See R. B. Steele, *Chiasmus in Sallust, Caesar, Tacitus and Justinus* (Johns Hopkins Diss., 1890), pp. 49 and 8.

<sup>2</sup> The passage quoted by G. A. Davies (Pitt Press Edn.) to disprove this (I. 18. 4-5) is not in the least parallel. Compare, on the other hand, *Hist.* I. 7. 12-13; IV. 58. 17; *Ann.* IV. 56; *Germ.* 16; *Dial.* 34. 5-6; etc.



TACITUS, *AGR.* 9. 3.

'Ubi officio satis factum, nulla ultra potestatis persona; tristitiam et adrogantiam et avaritiam exuerat; nec illi . . . aut facilitas auctoritatem aut severitas amorem deminuit.'

THIS passage has been variously handled and understood. In the Furneaux-Anderson edition, which discusses the question at length, the phrase *tristitiam . . . exuerat* has been bracketed as an interpolation, following Wex.

Certainly, in the received text, the words seem awkwardly placed, but otherwise they present no insuperable difficulty. It is true that the verb *exuo* regularly is used of divesting oneself of something actually possessed, and Tacitus certainly does not mean to imply that Agricola ever was grim, arrogant and avaricious. But these qualities too often were exhibited by men in his position, and he might properly be said to have 'put them from him' or to have 'eschewed them.' That *exuo* may bear this meaning is made very probable by what is

said of Agrippina in the *Annals* VI. 25. 3: *dominandi avida, virilibus curis feminarum vitia exuerat*. Referring to *vitia*, Furneaux remarks: 'It is not implied that she had ever had them.'

In support of such interpretation of *exuerat*, attention is called to a passage in which the verb *aufsero* seems to be used in analogous fashion:

Tacitus, *Hist.* III. 84. 6 ff.: *pudenda latebra (Vitellius) semet occultans ab Iulio Placido tribuno cohortis protrahitur. Vincitae pone tergum manus; laniata veste foedum spectaculum ducebatur, multis increpantibus, nullo inlacrimante. Deformitas exitus misericordiam abstulerat.*

There seems no implication here that the spectators at first felt compassion; rather, from the very start, the shameful of the spectacle 'had precluded' pity; so Heraeus renders 'nicht aufkommen lassen.'

H. C. NUTTING.

*University of California.*

## REVIEWS

## THE COMPOSITION OF THE ODYSSEY.

*The Composition of Homer's Odyssey.*

By W. J. WOODHOUSE, Professor of Greek in the University of Sydney.

Pp. 251. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930. 12s. 6d. net.

THIS is a most refreshing book, marked by knowledge, candour, acuteness, simplicity of statement, and a welcome absence of *odium theologicum*. In contrast to many works on Homer, it gives the impression of really starting with the evidence and following where it leads, instead of starting with an orthodoxy and then bedevilling the evidence. But perhaps the chief secret of its charm is that it confines itself strictly to its subject. It faces one set of problems, proposes its own solution for each, and does not confuse the reader by citing or disproving the views of other scholars. Indeed, it scarcely mentions a single modern name from beginning to end.

The treatment in general reminds one strongly of Seck's brilliant *Quellen der Odyssee* (1887). Seck was the first to show systematically that the Homeric question is not a problem of interpolation, but a problem of sources, though he looked for his sources chiefly in other forms of the Odysseus story—one ver-

sion ending in a bow fight, one in a spear fight; one using a transformation motive, and one not—and treated our *Odyssey*, united by the *Telemachia*, as a sort of Diatessaron. Mr. Woodhouse seeks his sources partly in a supposed quasi-historical saga of Odysseus, partly in various folk-tales and travellers' yarns, all of them apparently already extant in verse form before Homer's day. He shows how 'Homer' took over whole passages verbatim; and in an admirable closing chapter expounds the ancient conception of a poet as narrator of an *ὄν λόγος*, using 'materials for the most part secondhand, reused, and reused in some places without reference to their original function,' as contrasted with the nineteenth-century demand for individual originality.

A summary can do no justice to Mr. Woodhouse's arguments, but may illustrate their general line. Thus the Nausikaa story is an old folk-tale incomplete. It should tell of the winning of a princess by an unknown wanderer, but the climax has been left out in order not to upset the plot of the *Odyssey*. In the *Niptra*, again, the original story no doubt told how the returning husband, wishing to reveal himself, ar-

ranged that his old nurse should wash his feet and recognise him by the scar: [that she informed his wife in secret; that then by a plot with her husband] the wife brought out the bow which none but he could use. But the *Odyssey* leaves out the part we have put in brackets, and makes the story almost unintelligible. (The old version seems to be implied in the story told by the ghost of Amphimedon in Book XXIV.) Again in the folk-tale the wife who wove the web by day and unwove it by night surely achieved something by her ingenuity; in the *Odyssey* she is merely found out, and nothing happens.

Both Seeck and Mr. Woodhouse regard the various false stories told by Odysseus (in Books XIII., XIV., XIX.) as remnants of another form of the saga, but in general Mr. Woodhouse makes more use of anonymous folk-tales. Seeck, for example, assumes that Odysseus was already the hero of the older *Niptra*, while Mr. Woodhouse assumes that he was not. The folk-tales are doubtless a *vera causa*, but it seems to me easier to explain some of the doublets in the *Odyssey*—Kirke and Kalypso, Melantho and Melanthios, etc.—if both versions were already current about Odysseus, so that 'Homer' in framing his epic did not like to leave either of them out, than if they were merely folk-tales about an anonymous hero. Perhaps Mr. Woodhouse, in spite of his full appreciation of the tradition, wishes to leave as wide a gap as possible between the great Homer, composer of the *Odyssey*, and his inferior predecessors; but here we strike on a snag which has always baffled me. The composer of the *Odyssey* is certainly the author of the *Telemachia*; as Mr. Woodhouse says, 'No *Telemachia*, no *Odyssey*.'

The *Telemachia* must be Homer's own original and authentic work. Why, then, is it on the whole the flattest and least inspired part of the poem? Is it not really easier, if we must give the composer some name, to think of him not as Homer, but as one of the Homeridae?

Among small points of detail one is sometimes puzzled by Mr. Woodhouse's habit in translation of leaving out his definite articles: 'Whoso shall easiest string bow in hands and arrow shoot through axes twelve all' has an odd effect. I doubt also, though here I may well be wrong, whether he is not sometimes too subtle in his interpretations of the traditional epic style, as when he thinks that Homer means Alkinoos to be 'a bit of a buffoon,' or Odysseus to be falsely boasting that Kirke 'desired him for her husband,' or Telemachos to be 'hysterical' (p. 113).

Let me finish by putting to Mr. Woodhouse one or two questions which are not meant for criticisms. If there is some awkwardness in the setting of the poem as a contest between Poseidon and Athena, may that not be explained by the influence of the famous Athenian myth? And if Odysseus' return to Penelope is delayed so punctiliously till the Σύνωδος Ἡλίου καὶ Σελήνης on the dawn of the ἔννη καὶ νέα of the nineteenth-twentieth year—i.e. the exact end of the Great Eniautos according to Meton—is there not more behind that curious fact than a wish to have Telemachos grown up? However, one short book cannot deal with all subjects, and it is partly because of its concentration and strict attention to business that I can warmly recommend this book as an introduction to the study of the Homeric question.

G. MURRAY.

Christ Church, Oxford.

#### PROFESSOR BETHE ON HOMER.

*Homer, Dichtung und Sage.* Zweiter Band. *Odyssee*; Kuklos, Zeitbestimmung. Zweite Auflage. Two vols. (also published as one vol.). Pp. xv+389 in all; 1 plate. Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1929. Teil I.: *Odyssee*, bound, 9s.; Teil II.: *Kuklos, Zeitbestimmung*, bound, 11s. Two parts in one vol., 14s.; bound, 16s.

WHILE the first and third volumes of Professor Bethe's *Homer, Dichtung und Sage* (*Die Ilias*, 1914; *Die Sage vom Troischen Kriege*, 1927) have been reviewed in the pages of this journal,<sup>1</sup> the second (*Die Odyssee*, 1922), published at a date when international scholarship

<sup>1</sup> XXIX., pp. 181 ff.; XLI., p. 221.

had not fully resumed its functions, apparently escaped notice. The appearance of this second edition in almost unaltered form affords an opportunity of rectifying the omission.

The present volume contains Book III., an analysis of the *Odyssey* into its component poems; Book IV., an extremely full and interesting investigation of the Trojan Cycle; and Book V., an attempt to fix the date of the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and Cycle.

The book on the *Odyssey* proceeds on familiar lines. Ingenious, speculative, and dogmatic, it seems in the end to leave us in that 'unfruchtbare Steppe' into which Lachmann decoyed Homeric criticism and from which Professor Bethe undertook to extricate it.

The book on the Trojan Cycle includes the fragments and a collection of testimonia, augmented in this edition by some four pages and now surely exhaustive. Dealing with material comparatively unfamiliar, it affords free scope to the massive erudition with which the author supports original views, presented with equal force and charm. The Cycle is regarded as the work of a single poet resident at Athens, who utilized a number of short epics of earlier date. From these he compiled a narrative continuous with the *Iliad*, which he knew in its present form and embedded in the middle of his own production. To the *Cypria*, the *Ante-Homerica*, corresponded the *Post-Homerica*, set forth in the *Little Iliad*, the poem which Aristotle knew, of which the *Aithiopis* and the *Ilioupersis* formed parts, as the *Embassy* and the *Ransoming* form parts of the *Iliad*. The section to which Proklos applies the title of *Little Iliad* cannot represent a separate poem. Thus there are no duplications in the Cycle: the Tale of Troy is told in chronological sequence from the *Διὸς βουλή* to the Sacrifice of Polyxena which concludes the *Ilioupersis*. Neither the *Cypria* nor the *Little Iliad* is conceivable without the *Iliad*; each forms part of a single design to introduce and complete it.

Though not free from difficulties, the theory is attractive, and the author's analysis of the plan and purpose of the Cycle considered as a single work is

extremely impressive. The ethical bias and the prominence given to examples of divine retribution have special interest in a work from which Aeschylus so often drew inspiration.

To deal adequately with the fifth book is difficult in the space available. Professor Bethe's late dating of the *Iliad* is well known. According to him the earliest element is the *Menis*, an Ionian poem of the eighth century. Round this gathered other poems, also Ionian, such as the *Embassy* and the *Ransoming of Hector*; finally, about 600 B.C. a poet living in Athens wrought the collection into a unity. To him are due the figure of Menestheus the Athenian leader, the *Supplication of Athena* in Book VI., and all such passages as show personal knowledge of the Troad, of which the Ionian poems are ignorant. To that personal knowledge, acquired by the Athenians at Sigeum, is due that pre-occupation with the events of the Trojan War to which Athenian vase-painting in the sixth century bears witness.

The explanation of this late dating is of course to be found in the author's theory of 'örtliche Verschiebung der Sage.' According to this the ancient saga of the Trojan War dealt with tribal conflicts on the mainland of Greece where it had its origin; it was carried to Asia Minor by Greek emigrants, and by them first connected with the town of Ilium about 700 B.C. We are not in this volume concerned with the theory itself, which is first fully expounded in Vol. III., but only with the method by which so late a dating is obtained. Of this the treatment of the *Supplication*, the *clou* of the position, may serve as an example. It is an organic part of our *Iliad*, for it is interwoven both with E and with H; it is late, for it implies the existence of a temple and an approximately life-size seated cult-statue; it is Athenian, for only Athenians would have transported their city goddess to Troy, and the ritual is modelled on that of Athena at Athens. Further, if the *Supplication* were traditional, the offering of the robe would be made by the wife of Priam: it is in fact made by Theano wife of Antenor; therefore, when the poem was composed, Antenoridai were ruling at Ilium and were personally

known to the Athenians at Sigeum and friendly to them; hence the sympathetic treatment of Antenor in the Iliad. Or, if not actually in Ilium in 600, they had only recently disappeared.

The candid reader will agree that the passage does imply the existence of a cult-statue, and that we have no archaeological evidence for the existence of life-size statues earlier than the middle of the seventh century. We must therefore admit the possibility that either the whole episode is late, or, what surely is equally possible, that the passage has been worked over. To assert, however, that the first appearance of the temple is equally late is to ignore the evidence, as Professor Bethe would have seen if he had gone direct to the report of the excavations at Sparta<sup>1</sup> instead of relying on von Salis (p. 317, n. 16). The early temple of Artemis Orthia<sup>2</sup> dates back to the ninth, perhaps to the tenth century; and where we have the temple we cannot dogmatically deny the possibility of the statue. Again, there is nothing specifically Athenian in the gift of a robe to a deity;<sup>3</sup> and so far as our evidence goes, the seated type of Athena occurs at least as early in Ionia as at Athens. The archaeological argument therefore falls to the ground, or at most proves the interpolation of a cult-image.

<sup>1</sup> B.S.A. XVI, p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> *Artemis Orthia*, J.H.S. Suppl., Vol. V., pp. 10-19.

<sup>3</sup> For a long list of examples see Frazer's Pausanias, Vol. II. 574, where it is shown that the image with which the rite was associated was often of high antiquity.

The cult at Troy, long before the Athenians were at Sigeum, of a goddess identified by the Greeks with Athena is guaranteed by the ritual of the Locrian Maidens, which Professor Bethe acknowledges to have originated in some historical event.

What can be said of the creation of an Antenorid dynasty on the sole ground that Theano was the wife of Antenor? Pindar brings the Antenoridai to Cyrene; Strabo, relying probably on Sophocles, to Illyria by way of Thrace. It was left for Dictys to instal the hero at Troy, whence he was expelled by Aineias. In view of traditions so divergent, is it conceivable that the family had been known to the Greek world as reigning at Troy at the end, or even the beginning, of the seventh century? The case for the late and Athenian origin of the Supplication rests therefore on no solid foundation; and on that case, as the author (p. 318) explicitly states, his theory of the composition and date of the Iliad mainly rests; while the Odyssey and the Cycle take the date of the Iliad as their *terminus post quem*.

Greek tradition combines with archaeological exploration to represent the Siege of Troy as an event which took place in the Troad late in the second millennium. The learned author dismisses the evidence of the first as valueless, that of the second as irrelevant. This is indeed the only course open to the champion of Sagenverschiebung.

H. L. LORIMER.

Somerville College, Oxford.

### THE PROMETHEUS BOUND.

*Untersuchungen zum Gefesselten Prometheus* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 9. Heft). By WILHELM SCHMID. Pp. 116. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1929. Paper, Rm. 7.50.

IN this book a veteran scholar lends the support of his age and learning to what still seems to one unconverted reader the delusion that Aeschylus did not write the *Prometheus Vincetus*. He reaches this conclusion from four different starting-points: the scene with Oceanus (pp. 5-20), the technical execution of

the drama (pp. 20-33), the presence of words and usages unparalleled in the other plays of Aeschylus (pp. 68-77), and the mythology and thought behind the play (pp. 77-109). Between the second and third of these sections he interposes a summary (pp. 34-68) of the details in which the *Prometheus* is consistent with Aeschylean usage, deducing from these the conclusion that 'der Verfasser des *Δεσμώτης* hat in Sprache und Stil starke Anregungen von Aischylos empfangen' (p. 77). His final conclusion is that the play reflects



the *αἰθαδία* combined with budding sophistry of thought and speech which characterised the second half of the fifth century at Athens; he would date it 458-445 B.C.

If citation of details were a final criterion, it might be relevant to point out that his section of genuinely Aeschylean parallels is more than twice as long as his list of inconsistencies. But he does not really base his argument upon these details; it rests upon a more fundamental divergence—that which separates the thought, style, and workmanship of the Aeschylus he knows from that of the 'Δεσμώτης-Dichter.' The impression made upon him by the *Prometheus* is clearly quite different from that made upon the present writer. If his view of the *Prometheus* is the right one, his book may be held to have settled the question beyond doubt. But in case this is not so, there is no harm in indicating some points where he seems to do the Δεσμώτης-Dichter less than justice.

1. The scene with Oceanus, which he would cancel entire as 'Füllsel und Folie' (p. 14), seems to him very much below the usual level of Aeschylus' work. This is partly because he pays little attention to anything but the stichomythia, and so hardly notices the description of the eruption of Etna (if this is by another poet than Aeschylus it is our misfortune that we do not know his name); but it is chiefly because he seems unconscious both of the humour of Oceanus himself and of his dramatic value. The first disability leads him to find Oceanus tedious where others find him a fit companion for the nurse in the *Choephoroe* and the Watchman in the *Agamemnon*. The second is more serious: he sums up most admirably elsewhere (pp. 22, 23) the progress of Prometheus' state of mind, but does not recognise how important a stage in that progress the visit of Oceanus is. Prometheus, who begins the play aghast at the undeservedness of his fate (241-243), is successively irritated by the respectable commonplaces of Oceanus, shocked by the suffering of Io, and rendered obdurate by the aggressiveness of Hermes: none of these factors can be omitted without loss.

2. It is at first assumed and later (pp. 106, 107) argued that the *Λυόμενος*, a genuine Aeschylean play, was *αὐτάρκης*. This leaves open two views of the Δεσμώτης, assuming that it was written later, with the *Λυόμενος* already in being: (1) That it was intended to lead up to the older play; (2) that it was meant to be *αὐτάρκης* itself. It does not seem entirely clear to which of these views Schmid adheres, but in the main he inclines to the theory of *αὐτάρκεια*. He thus treats the character of Prometheus as if it were not destined to undergo any further development, and so contends that the picture of the rebel must be either ironic—a suggestion he holds unbelievable of Aeschylus—or a reflexion of late-fifth-century *αἰθαδία*. But this is surely wrong. Prometheus is *αὐθάδης*, it is true: but his *αἰθαδία* is not commended; it is destined to be chastened and brought to submission. This is the answer also to the complaint (p. 19) that Plato did not cite the *Prometheus* among Aeschylean attacks upon the gods (*Rep.* II. 380a, 383a). The trilogy as a whole was, like the *Oresteia*, not an attack but a defence. Schmid seems inconsistent in this, since he recognises that the form of the Prometheus trilogy must have resembled that of the *Oresteia* (p. 17); but he uses this probable likeness as a proof that the Δεσμώτης must be an unskilful imitation by a later writer.

3. In the very interesting section on mythology and thought no notice is taken of a really important factor in the development of mythology—the influence of Orphism. This can be shown to have affected Aeschylus' 'Andacht zum Mythos' (p. 93; cf. Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*, pp. 430 n., 664 n.), and has been suggested as a source of Oceanus in this play (cf. George Thomson, *Notes on Prometheus Vincetus*, C.Q. XXIII., 1929, p. 161). Further, very little stress is laid on the geography of the play. This is noticed briefly in the list of Aeschylean parallels (p. 58) and is characterised in the full and useful Index as 'phantastisch'; but it does not seem to be sufficiently recognised how much more appropriate this fan-



tastic geography is to Aeschylus than to writers of a later date.

The book as a whole excites respect by its learning and keen interest by its matter and lucid style. That it seems like an *ex parte* argument, provocative

rather than persuasive, may be the outcome of an equal, but opposite, delusion.

J. R. BACON.

Girton College,  
Cambridge.

### THUCYDIDES AND SCIENCE.

*Thucydides and the Science of History.*

By CHARLES NORRIS COCHRANE. Pp. 180. London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford, 1929. 10s. net.

MR. COCHRANE sets out to give a fresh interpretation of Thucydides in the light of contemporary thought, and to establish (1), as against Cornford, that Thucydides was scientifically minded, (2) that his attempt to apply scientific method to the writing of history was successful, and (3) that this was not in the fifth century an isolated and unexplained phenomenon: his masters in scientific method were the early Hippocratics and Democritus, both of whom he will have known in the Thrace-ward regions. The first two propositions are doubtless true, and perhaps needed reaffirming; but it is the last which, though not new, is interesting, and which, if established, would be invaluable. Littre long ago observed a certain similarity of style between Thucydides and Hippocrates; but Mr. Cochrane argues that 'the analogy goes much deeper than mere style: that, in fact, Thucydides adapted the principles and methods of Hippocratic medicine to the interpretation of history.' This leads to considerable hopes; but they are disappointed. Mr. Cochrane can show that there is analogy between the two in the careful observing, testing, and recording of facts before generalization, and with a view to *prognosis*. He can point to other particular similarities, as the regular Hippocratic use of *πρόφασις* to mean 'exciting cause,' though he should point out that Thucydides does not always use the word in this sense (*e.g.* iii. 82. 4, III. 1). But his analysis is not sufficiently penetrating to be of value; it hardly goes beyond a comparison of the two chapters of Gomperz; and, when he emphasizes the scientific char-

acter of Thucydides' description of the plague, which 'constitutes the most intimate link between him and Hippocrates, and seems indeed to be the bridge between the two,' he should at least note that his introductory words (λεγέτω μὲν οὖν περὶ αὐτοῦ ὡς ἕκαστος γινώσκει καὶ ἱατρός καὶ ἰδιώτης ἀφ' ὅτου εἰκὸς ἦν γενέσθαι αὐτό, καὶ τὰς αἰτίας ἄστυνας νομίζει τοσαύτης μεταβολῆς ἱκανὰς εἶναι δύναμιν σchein· ἐγὼ δὲ οἶόν τε ἐρίγνετο λέξω καὶ ἀφ' ὧν ἂν τις σκοπῶν, εἴ ποτε καὶ αὐθις ἐπιπέσοι, μάλιστ' ἂν ἔχοι τι προειδὼς μὴ ἀγνοεῖν, τὰτα δηλώσω αὐτὸς τε νοσήσας καὶ αὐτὸς ἰδὼν ἄλλους νοσοῦντας)—that these words, while implying care in observation, suggest a certain impatience with medical theory. Indeed they suggest the very unscientific attitude of the plain man who wants only facts. Fortunately, we have enough of Thucydides to know that this would be misleading; but this passage cannot be ignored (in this connexion) when his relation to the Hippocratics is being discussed; particularly as, even in the most 'positivist' of the Hippocratic treatises, are to be found hypotheses akin to those of the early nature-philosophers, which Thucydides may well have rejected.

In any case, the discussion occupies only some thirty pages of the book and is therefore necessarily general, if not superficial. The other chapters deal with such problems as the state and the relation of the individual to its authority, inter-state relations (where, by the way, the importance of the arbitration-clause in the treaty of 445 is greatly exaggerated), government, and war and revolution, and the attitude towards these problems of positive science as represented by Thucydides contrasted with that of philosophy. (Also a cursory and defective chapter on scientific history after Thucydides.) The discussion is a

sober one, if not very novel, but the conclusions are too stiffly drawn. Though approaching from a different angle, Mr. Cochrane gets the same result as did Bury, that the survival values of the qualities of men and states are all that interested Thucydides; for 'scientific history must inevitably be utilitarian, in the sense that it limits itself to the observation of those facts which are demonstrably "useful" to the individual and to the race'; and since Thucydides is a scientific historian, he must so limit himself: *a priori* reasoning, which leads to a conclusion that is, to me, irreconcilable with the general tone of the *History* and in particular with such passages as that on the results of *stasis* in Greece. But there is no reason why scientific history should be thus limited. According to Mr. Cochrane 'Aristotle, in the famous sentence in which he says that "the state comes into existence to satisfy the bare needs of life, and con-

tinues for the sake of the good life," begins as a scientist, but ends as a philosopher.' But in both the first and the second part of the sentence Aristotle is stating a conclusion drawn from his observation of facts, is therefore scientific (whether his conclusion be true or false); and it is as much the historian's business to note the development or the breakdown of the 'good life' in a state, even though the state survive, as that of the state itself. Again, a belief, like Herodotus', that it is possible that the gods sometimes interfere in human affairs, does not, of itself, preclude scientific method; if Herodotus' belief (however false) was the result of a careful examination of facts known to him, it was scientific. Mr. Cochrane throughout narrows the meaning of the word to that which it bears in positive science; but there are also scientific and unscientific approaches to the problems of philosophy.

A. W. GOMME.

#### XENOPHON'S *HELLENICA*.

*Xenophontis Historia Graeca*. Recensuit C. HUDE. Editio maior. Pp. xii + 343. Leipzig: Teubner, 1930. Bound, Rm. 8; unbound, 6.80.

THIS is an excellent piece of work. Hude has done all that can be done, with the available evidence, to produce a readable text; and it is no fault of his that much must still—and probably for ever—remain uncertain.

He has made a new collation of *Parisinus* 1738 (B)—by far the best manuscript. After reading his collation, I have no doubt that he is right in attaching even more importance to its testimony than his predecessors have done. For instance, at I. vi. 12 he puts *ἀντιῶσθαι* in the text with B only: the rest have *ἐναντιῶσθαι*. In *Cyropaedia* IV. ii. 39 the three *meliores* have *ἀντιῶσαι*. On the basis of this, Hude proposes *ἀνρία* for *τὰν ἀνρία* at VII. i. 28. It is unfortunate that the article on the verb in the new Liddell and Scott is incorrect. Just occasionally, I think, Hude defers rather too much to B: thus it does not seem an improvement to omit the third *ἡμᾶς* at

VI. iii. 4, nor *παράδοσιν* at IV. i. 15, with B only.

He has also made the first complete collation of *Urbina* 117 (U): the result is chiefly valuable as a check on the readings of *Parisinus* 2080 (C).

In the important matter of orthography and forms he bases his text on the inscriptions and Rutherford respectively; and he has produced abundant confirmation from the manuscript evidence. He admits variation of spelling—*ἐς*, *εἰς*; *ἐσθήματα*, *-ηνα*; *κεῖνος*, *ἐκεῖνος*; *ξυν-*, *συν-*; *κάω*, *καίω*; and so on. One example will serve to illustrate his method. At I. i. 24 he reads *τὰ σώματα* *σᾶ* with Dindorf, because BC omit the adjective, though all other MSS. have *σῶ(ι)α*; but at VII. iv. 4, where B is not extant, he gives *σῶα* with all the available MSS. He is the first, so far as I know, to exalt *ἀνεξυνοῦτο* to the dignity of a position in the text at I. i. 30, following the statement of Suidas, though all the MSS. have *ἀνεκοινοῦτο*.

His collations have enabled him, with the help of a very slight conjec-

ture, to restore I. vii. 27. His version differs considerably from Keller's text, and seems clearly right. It runs thus: ἀλλ' ἴσως, ἂν τινα καὶ οὐκ αἰτίον ὄντα ἀποκτείνητε, μεταμελήσει [δὲ] ὕστερον· ἀναμνήσθητε <δὲ>. Other conjectures of his own that seem certain are πλείστους [αὐτῶν] ἀθροίσας (II. ii. 9), συμμένοι ἂν for συμμένομεν (VII. i. 2), and <έν> Ἑλληνισί (VII. iii. 10): also <Ότυν> τὸν τῶν Παφλαγόνων βασιλέα, which he suggests in the apparatus at IV. i. 2. At III. iv. 27 he has altered εἶναι after ὥς to εἶη (cf. II. ii. 2; VI. v. 42). Yet in V. iv. 35 he keeps εἰπὼν ὅτι . . . ἀντειπεῖν. He has bracketed several words that appear in different positions in the MSS.—and generally one is strongly inclined to agree with him. But I am doubtful about [ὁ πόλεμος] ἐπολεμεῖτο at V. i. 1. The critical note runs ὁ πόλεμος post ἐπολεμεῖτο CU, om. D. But compare *Mem.* III. v. 10: and the omission in D doesn't count. So at VII. v. 22 he adopts Dindorf's [ἀναλαβεῖν] παραγέλας <εἰς> τὰ ὄπλα, though only D omits the infinitive.

At V. iv. 62 he gives νομίσαντες <ὅτι> . . . ἔσονται with Castalio. This is, of course, impossible, and the correct emendation is doubtless <ὥς>. At VI. iii. 13 he accepts the much approved emendation of Hartman, ὥς . . . ἐγνώτε for ἂ . . . ἐγνώμεν. I have never felt convinced by this attractive conjecture, because Weiske and Schneider saw that something—it must be a good deal, I think—is lost in this

passage. The context of the sentence has gone. The speaker says in the next sentence that he proposes to dwell further on τὸ σύμφορον, to which there has been no previous allusion.

But enough of picking holes. It remains only to express my admiration of the immense industry that is apparent in this book, and of the editor's exquisite scholarship.

I append a conjecture on III. v. 3. Nobody is really happy—or could be happy—with ἐκ τῆς ἀμφισβητήσιμον χώρας . . . χρήματα τελέσαι; but no conjecture proposed for τελέσαι carries conviction. Schneider's ἐλάσαι may be right: but is not συλῆσαι highly probable in view of the passages cited from Herodotus in L. and S.?

E. C. MARCHANT.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

P.S.—Since this notice was written, the *editio minor*, containing only the text and the *index nominum*, has appeared. It may be worth while to point out that at IV. iv. 11 Hude rightly gives ἡλλοντο in the text in spite of BU (ἤλοντο). The imperfect is clearly intended, not, as Veitch and Jebb (*Soph. O.R.* 1311) supposed, the aorist. Conversely, at IV. v. 7, BP have καθαλλόμενος, where the present is impossible: the choice lies between καθαλά- and καθαλόμενος. In view of the little controversy about the aorist forms of ἄλλομαι Hude might have included them in the *index orthographicus* of his *editio maior*.

E. C. M.

#### CLASSICAL STUDIES.

*Classical Studies.* By G. M. SARGEAUNT.

Pp. 285. London: Chatto and Windus, 1929. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

*Essays and Addresses.* By JOHN BURNET, with a memoir by Lord CHARNWOOD.

Pp. 299. London: Chatto and Windus, 1929. Cloth, 15s.

*John Burnet, 1863-1928.* Pp. 28. From the Proceedings of the British Academy. Vol. XIV. London: Milford. Paper, 2s. net.

COLLECTIONS of essays are necessary evils. Mr. Sargeaunt's suffer less than others from the disconnectedness which

makes them unsatisfactory reading, for a definite outlook and attitude marks his papers and gives them unity. Perhaps it is from Pater that he has drawn not only occasional languors of style, but his emphasis on the relations of art and literature, of μουσική and γυμναστική, and his sense both of the aesthetic values of Greek life and of a certain inadequacy in Hellenism. The best of the essays are the first, in which the author contrasts the Odysseus of Homer and the Ulysses of Tennyson, 'The Greek Athletic Ideal'—a study of

Pindar—and 'An Aspect of Education in Plato's Laws,' which is interesting if not entirely convincing. Mr. Sargeaunt has made no new discoveries, but he has the originality of a man who has felt anew for himself the themes on which he writes, and so can treat the old subjects—even the Greek View of Life—with freshness. He is most original where he deals with the treatment of classical myths in modern art and literature; though these papers are not exempt from the weakness of the literary essayist who states views rather than argues them. It is surely perverse to compare the Eclogues of Virgil, largely imitative, tentative, experimental, at times *pastiche*, the work of a man feeling his way, with the maturity of Giorgione's Fête Champêtre. It is strange to say that Theocritus never strikes a note of 'high seriousness, while it is the presence of this seriousness which makes the pastoral spirit of Giorgione akin to that of Virgil.' It is very questionable whether Tintoretto reveals the Greek 'ideals of physical beauty and life,' or 'Botticelli interprets the early and unspoiled artistic genius of Greece.' And surely the daring originality, the creative and revolutionary imagination, with which Tintoretto treats his themes, makes him a very unsuitable comparison for Pindar. Titian would be a better parallel. But even where his views are questionable, Mr. Sargeaunt is stimulating, and he has given us an attractive example of a type of scholarship peculiarly British—the scholarship of the amateur (in the original and good sense of the word), the man who reads the classics, loves them, and sees in them a pattern and ideal of life.

The Essays and Addresses of John Burnet recall one of the most powerful and virile minds in recent British scholarship. We see him here on different sides, in the field of philosophy which he made peculiarly his own, as an educationist, and in some of his rare excursions into purely literary criticism. We see his weakness as well as his strength. He was too whole-hearted a Platonist to be quite fair to Aristotle. He has the Scotch tendency to dogmatism—as in his views on grammar teaching and on the use of translations. He

is not at his best as a literary critic, and though, in the essay on Euripides, his demolition of Verrall's fantasies is admirable, he fails when he proceeds to interpret the *Hercules Furens*. But every paper, on whatever subject, is illuminated by flashes that reveal the quality both of his intellect and of his personality.

Burnet was not only a great scholar and—as Lord Charnwood in his introduction emphasises—a great teacher: he was a great educationist. Indeed, though everything in this book was worth preserving, many readers will value most highly the essays on education. That perhaps is not surprising. For the best things ever said on education were said by Plato, and here Burnet was permeated with the spirit of the master to whose interpretation he consecrated so much of his life. Sentences like the following have the true Platonic spirit: 'Education is in the main the art of guiding the child to imitate the right things and in the right way.' 'The chief purpose of education is to form an élite, not for its own sake, but for that of society.' 'So far as we can see, the decay (in society) has always set in at the top.' 'For the grown man, grammar may be one of the most dangerously fascinating studies.' 'The supremacy of classical education is based upon the fact that it is concerned with the interpretation of the highest products of the human mind. And this work of interpretation is always having to be done afresh. It cannot be stored or transmitted in books. Each fresh soul has to understand the masterpieces for itself as if no one had ever understood them before.'

This is pure humanism. But no one understood better than Burnet that mere humanism is incomplete, and that the secret of education is to blend humanism and science, as the great Greeks did, and as Plato did more completely perhaps than any. Burnet, though not a scientist, valued science as much as humanism and saw that it was essential to keep them united. His gravest charge against Aristotle is that he made 'a breach between philosophy and science.' Yet, learned as he was, he was never besotted by 'research.' How sane is the irony of this passage!—



'The aesthetic interpretation of a tragedy, or the philosophical interpretation of a Platonic dialogue is not "research"; the investigation of scholia and lexicæ is. It is "research" to argue about the name of a figure in the Parthenon pediment; it is not "research" to investigate its aesthetic significance.' How salutary is this warning!—"Research" is certainly laborious; but in its lower forms, it requires little knowledge and makes few calls upon the higher powers of the mind.'

Our one regret in connexion with this book is that it has not reprinted more than one essay from Burnet's

*Higher Education and the War*—one of the few good books on education, though a little clouded by war-time feelings.

Professor A. E. Taylor and Mr. W. L. Lorimer in papers reprinted from the Proceedings of the British Academy give an estimate of Burnet and his work, followed by a bibliography. No two persons are so well equipped to write of Burnet as philosopher, scholar and teacher, and their notices admirably supplement the picture of him given by the *Essays* and by Lord Charnwood's introduction.

R. W. LIVINGSTONE.

### THE LOEB PLATO, VII.

*Plato, with an English Translation, VII. (Timæus, Critias, Clitophon, Menæxenus, Epistles).* By R. G. BURY, Litt.D. Pp. 636; 3 plates illustrative of the *Critias*. London: William Heinemann, Ltd.; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1929. Cloth, 10s.; leather, 12s. 6d.

THIS is certainly one of the better 'Loebs,' though hardly, I think, one of the very best. A reader who wants simply to get at the contents of the *Timæus* and *Epistles* will find himself presented with a much more trustworthy rendering of the one than Archer-Hind's, and of the other than Mr. Post's; indeed, I do not believe he is likely to be led into serious misunderstanding by trusting to the translation, except unfortunately in one very important sentence of the *Timæus*. But the text printed with the versions seems to me antiquated in the case of the *Timæus*, and in both the *Timæus* and *Epistles*—I have not examined it very minutely for the *Clitophon* or *Menæxenus*—disfigured by the editor's weakness for dubious conjectural 'emendations' of a usually sound MSS. tradition. Indeed in the *Timæus* and *Critias* the editor starts with an error of principle which is bound to lead to a poor text. He bases his own text on that of the Turicensis, which means that it is constructed throughout on the notoriously false theory that A is the *codex optimus* for the dialogue.

Unfortunately it has long been established not only that there is no one 'best' MS. of Plato, but that in the *Timæus* there are four *optimi*, AFWY, which often disagree, and sometimes all agree together against a *deterior* which has the certainly true reading. Hence the information about the text given by the editor, with its delusive references to a 'best MS.,' shown on scrutiny to be A, is wholly misleading, as well as insufficient. I own I am surprised that, with the texts of Burnet and Rivaud before him, Mr. Bury should have shirked recording the readings of the four principal MSS. and some of those known from the *testimonia* in all cases of moment; the work might have been done in a few hours. If scruples about copyright forbade—though I do not see that they need have done—at any rate misleading information should not have been supplied, and important facts should not have been suppressed. Thus in the most important disputed passage in the whole dialogue, 40e 1, the reader ought certainly to know that Mr. Bury's own 'best MS.' has the reading τὴν περὶ τὸν διὰ παντὸς τεταμένον πόλον, as against F, Y (and apparently W). This is obviously the true reading; if Mr. Bury hesitated to take the mention of it from Burnet or Rivaud, he might have found it in either Bekker's or Bast's collation of A. It proves, of course, that Aristotle was quite right in



saying that the dialogue teaches that the earth moves. Mr. Bury not only prints the false text of the vulgate without any warning that his own 'best MS.' has a different text, but appends a note in which he summarily asserts that the dialogue teaches the earth's immobility—a mistake for which there is not the excuse in 1930 there might have been sixty years ago. This is surely not to deal fairly with Plato, with Aristotle, or with the confiding reader.

Fortunately this is perhaps the only place where a difference of reading makes so serious a difference to the interpretation. But there are many minor cases in which the MS. evidence is either inaccurately stated, or misinterpreted, or both. Thus at 17a 9 the false and facile *μηχανώμενοι* of the vulgate is given without any mention of the obviously sound *μηχανωμένους* of AWY. At 29b 8 *ἀνικητοῖς* (A) is given—this time probably rightly, as it was what Cicero read—but it is not added that FWY agree in *ἀκινήτοις*. At 54b 2 again the text gives what is probably the true, or nearly the true, reading, *ἀνευρόντι δὲ μή*, but not a word is said to show that this comes from a *codex deterior*, all the 'best MSS.' agreeing in omitting the *μή*. At 37b 7 we read '*ὁρθὸς ἰών* some MSS.; *ὢν* other MSS.'—a statement which conceals the awkward fact that Mr. Bury's 'best MS.' A is one of the 'others' which give the false lection *ὢν*. At 27b 9 again, there is no reference to the fact that this 'best' MS. reads not *καλέσαντα* but *ἐπικαλέσαντα*, which *proves* that Mr. Bury's insertion of the necessary *εἴη* in the clause is made at the wrong place, the EIII being merely an error for EIH. I could easily multiply examples, but even those I have given are enough to show how worse than useless most of the information about textual matters is. If the reader is to be told anything about the subject he should have been told somewhere what are the most important MSS. and other sources for the text, and exactly what stands in them in places where there is a divergence of any significance. As it is, I doubt whether anyone would discover from the volume that it is not the same

group of MSS. which are the important ones for *Timaeus*, for *Epistles*, and for *Menexenus*.

I do not think the editor usually happy in the conjectures he adopts or originates. I am glad, indeed, that he prints Cook Wilson's admirable *αὐξομένων* in *Tim.* 22d 7, but I can see nothing to be said for the substitution of *χρηστικόν*—a word unknown to Plato, and I believe to fourth-century Attic writers in general—for *χρήσιμον* in the phrase (*Tim.* 47c 8) *ὅσον τ' αὖ μουσικῆς φωνῇ χρήσιμον*, or for the change of *περιφερόμενον* (*Tim.* 49e 4) to *περιφερόμενον*. (I do not know how the conjectural text is supposed to be construed.) So an alteration like that at *Ep.* VII. 352a 4, when *γενομένων* is changed to *λεγομένων*, strikes me as certainly uncalled for and probably injurious. Plato is, according to the MSS., saying that he finds it necessary to state his motives for his last visit to Syracuse fully, *διὰ τὴν ἀτοπίαν καὶ ἀλογίαν τῶν γενομένων*, because the actual results did not correspond to their intentions. I cannot see why he must be made to say rather 'because other persons told absurd stories about him,' and I should be very sorry myself to foist on Plato such an expression as *διὰ τὴν ἀλογίαν τῶν λεγομένων*. Plato is, however, treated much worse by Messrs. Bury and Howald at *Ep.* VII. 351c 7, when they change the *οὐ τι* in the phrase *οὐ τι δι' ὀλιγίστων θανάτων καὶ φόνων* into *ὁ τι*, and thus put into the philosopher's mouth a brutally cynical approval of the execution of a plan of political reform 'with the minimum of murder.' I think we may be sure that that phrase, at any rate, never came from Plato. (Qy. should we not read *οὐ τι <οὐδὲ> δι' ὀλιγίστων*, which gives exactly the sense it would otherwise be necessary to get out of the *οὐ τι* by itself? Between *οὐ τι* and *δι'* the absorption of *οὐδὲ* would be easy.)

As to the translation itself, it is not what Mr. Bury rather unkindly calls Archer-Hind's version of the *Timaeus*, 'stylish,' but it has two real merits which deserve grateful acknowledgement: a real effort is made to catch and preserve the sense of the Platonic metaphors which most translators are

too apt to ignore, and in the main the rendering is accurate. Most of the 'howlers' of earlier versions have been avoided, though there are a few things of the kind left. Thus at *Tim.* 45b 5 Mr. Bury makes the same singular mistake as Archer-Hind of connecting the words *οἰκεῖον ἐκάστης ἡμέρας* not with *σῶμα*, to which they really belong, but with *φῶς*, though his own punctuation of the Greek on the opposite page requires the other, and correct, construction. It is odd again that in *Ep.* VII. 339d 8 the words *τῶν δὲ Ἀθηνησέων* . . . *οἶον ἐξωθούτων με* should be misrendered, 'the Athenians . . . were pushing me out,' as though *τῶν Ἀθηνησέων* were the genitive of *οἱ Ἀθηνησέων*. Of course, the persons meant are Dion and his companions, who were making their headquarters at Athens at the time referred to. Dionysius and Archytas, says Plato, were, so to say, pulling at him from one side, and 'the other party,' Dion, was pushing him out of Athens. And it is the mere reproduction of a very bad old 'howler' to render *τὸν Λυκούργον ἀρχαῖον ἀποδείξων* at *Ep.* IV. 320d 6, 'to play the part of the ancient worthy Lycurgus.' The words mean the only thing they grammatically can mean, 'to make Lycurgus look like a back number.' That, of course, was what a 'philosophic statesman' from the Academy was expected to do.

Mr. Bury does not often fall into those 'booby-traps,' but I think the Greek scholar who reads his version with the text by his side will find that he fairly often lets himself be led into lesser inaccuracies by not allowing sufficiently for the *hyperbaton* so characteristic of Plato's later manner. This, however, does not affect the substantial faithfulness of his version. What I myself feel wanting in it is chiefly care in ascertaining the precise sense of certain very commonly recurring words, especially of the connecting particles. A translator needs, for example, to remember that *γάρ* often means not 'for' but 'in fact,' that *δή* by no means always means 'moreover,' and it is to his advantage to know that *σαφής* more commonly means 'certain' than 'clear.' Still, as

NO. CCCXXVII. VOL. XLIV.

I say, on the whole, if not in all matters of detail, the actual translation seems to me good in everything except a certain lack of living style, and frequently it has happy turns of phraseology on which, as a brother-translator, I make Mr. Bury my sincere compliments.

The explanatory and introductory matter seems to me of unequal value. Much of it will be useful to the reader, but now and then it may lead him into unfortunate delusions. I certainly hope no one will be led by the remarks on *Tim.* 32a into imagining with Mr. Bury that *δγκος* here, or anywhere in Greek, means 'a cubic number,' and still less into the more dangerous implied belief that if *a* and *b* are integers  $\sqrt{a^3 b^3}$  is rational. It is not, of course, unless  $a^3 b^3$  is a square number, as is not usually the case. And I should like to know who can have convinced Mr. Bury that 'the angle next after the bluntest obtuse angle' means one of  $179^\circ$  (p. 132). Of course the words mean 'the least angle which is greater than  $\pi/2$  and not less than  $\pi$ ,' i.e. an angle of  $180^\circ$ . Timaeus is indicating the nature of the solid angle of the tetrahedron by mentioning that it is, so to say, enclosed by three angles of  $60^\circ$ , and  $60 \times 3 = 180$ , not 179. Also *ἐφεξῆς* in a series means 'coming immediately after,' not 'coming just before.' Apart from these two grave lapses, and the wholly misleading note about the earth's motion or immobility, the explanatory notes to the *Timaeus* and *Critias* will be found generally helpful by the English reader, though I doubt whether the attempt to evaluate the cosmology of the dialogue as a whole, made in the Introduction, will be found of equal value. The subject is too large to be profitably dealt with, unless on a scale which permits of serious discussion of diverging views; and discussion is just what Mr. Bury's Introduction does not provide. In the Introductions to the *Epistles*, there is fairly full information for the reader about the historical facts of Plato's Syracusan adventure. Unfortunately, Mr. Bury has a violent *animus* against admitting the authenticity of any epistles, except perhaps VII. and VIII.; all the others are condemned very con-

fidently, but most of them on evidence which ought not to hang a dog. I should advise any reader anxious to judge for himself always to study each Epistle first before he reads Mr. Bury's

Introduction to it; the Introduction is sure to be couched in the spirit of a vehement 'speech for the prosecution.'

A. E. TAYLOR.

*The University, Edinburgh.*

### THE GREEK CITY AND ITS INSTITUTIONS.

*The Greek City and its Institutions.*

By G. GLOTZ. Pp. xx+416. London: Kegan Paul, 1929. 16s.

IN view of the lack of an up-to-date treatise on Greek constitutions by a British or American scholar, the present translation of Glotz's *Cité Grecque* comes opportunely. This work is in three parts, of which the first traces the development of the city to the threshold of democracy; the second describes in some detail the Athenian democracy of the fifth century; the third follows out the decline of the independent πόλις to the Macedonian conquest. The Government of Sparta only receives some passing allusions, and the by no means uneventful history of the πόλις in the Hellenistic age falls outside the author's purview.

Professor Glotz has produced a book that is at once learned and extremely readable. He has handled his almost unwieldy mass of facts so that each detail helps on the argument, and the result is a series of vivid and seductive pictures of Greek political man. Moreover, he never forgets that constitutions do not function *in vacuo*, but is at pains to explain the *milieu* out of which each form of government was created.

Another great merit of this volume is the clearness with which the complicated machinery of the Athenian democracy is analysed, and the candour with which its merits no less than its demerits are avowed.

By way of contrast, Professor Glotz perhaps does not render full justice to the early aristocracies, in that he does not sufficiently emphasise their services in enforcing compulsory justice and helping to create a sovereign νόμος τῆς πόλεως. As for the fourth century, he exhibits this as a dark foil to the high lights of the Periclean age: the morality of Greece had sunk to that of the Cities of the Plain, malthusianism and individ-

ualism ran mad, physical culture had become a purely professional affair, and economically the country was a capitalist hell. As the evidence for this Sallustian diatribe comes partly from comic poets, partly from authors who are not describing the fourth century in particular or at all, its conclusions require continual checking.

In accordance with the classical theory of Fustel de Coulanges, Professor Glotz represents the πόλις as an orderly development from a group of patriarchal γένη. But it can hardly be doubted that its placid growth was disturbed in the social dislocation that attended the invasions of the Late Helladic age; and though in some cases a city-state of the historic period may have stood in direct line of descent from a Minoan town, this does not suffice to prove its patriarchal origin, for nothing is known of the family organisation of the pre-Aryan folk of Greece. Similarly it is by no means sure that in the developed city the γένη formed the chief link between the community and the individual. In official documents the γένη figure far less frequently than the φυλαί and φρατρίαι, and in these groups it would be unsafe to take a tie of kinship for granted.

On matters of detail Professor Glotz often makes categorical statements where a hint of a doubt might seem apposite: e.g. that the *hektemoroi* kept only one-sixth of their produce (pp. 119, 124); that the plight of the Greek peasantry c. 600 B.C. was due to the sudden imposition of a money economy (p. 103); that the dump of inscribed sherds recently discovered at Athens does not relate to the ostracism of 443 B.C., but to an undated and abortive ballot (p. 171); that the limitation of the βουλῆ's jurisdiction dated back to 501 B.C. (p. 199); that Lycurgus was officially styled ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει (p. 214).

A few more *adnotatiunculae*. In the face of Thucydides and the speech *Pro Polystrato* it hardly seems safe to assert that in the Constitution of the Five Thousand 'the minimum was in fact a maximum' (p. 76). The Spartan Apella was not limited to men over thirty (pp. 83, 85): *vide* Busolt's *Staatsaltertümer*. Professor Meritt has recently shown that the Cleisthenic prytany-year counted an average of 365½, not (as on pp. 183, 187) of 360 days. The connexion between tyranny and ceramics, which Professor Glotz regards as obvious (p. 110), is not borne out by the case of the Pisistratids, whose wealth was almost certainly derived from mines, or of the Milesian despots, for the origin of 'Milesian' pottery is not certain. On p. 209 Professor Glotz states that *κλήρωσις* was applied to the archons

before Solon's reforms. Whatever precisely the crucial passage in 'Aθ. Πολ. ch. 8 § 2 may mean, it cannot bear this sense. On p. 332 we read that 'Aθ. Πολ. does not discuss the *νομοθέται* because Aristotle considered them unimportant. Can we be sure that he did not mention them in the lost concluding chapters, along with other dicastic institutions? On p. 76 read 321 B.C. vice 312; on p. 194 *κοσμητής* vice *κοσμήτωρ*. Five hundred medimni make 720, not 590 bushels (p. 120); and the 'piécettes d'or' which constituted the fees of Homeric judges were not gold *coins* (p. 252). 'Les Athéniens étaient souvent obligés de plaider dans des villes mal disposées pour eux' (*ἐλασσούμενοι ἐν ταῖς ξυμβολαίαις δίκαις*) is not as much as to say that 'the Athenians were bad merchants' (p. 283).

M. CARY.

#### THE GREAT WRITERS OF ROME.

*The Great Writers of Rome.* By ROBERT SEYMOUR CONWAY, Litt.D., D.Litt., recently Professor of Latin in the University of Manchester. Pp. 80. (Sixpenny Library.) London: Benn, 1930. Paper, 6d. net.

ANYONE who has experienced or imagined the difficulty of conveying to others in a very limited number of pages the salient features of a whole literature will understand the nature of the task which here confronted Professor Conway. Even with the restriction to 'great' writers, powerful compression was imperative; but it may be said at once that this booklet is a very successful and stimulating introduction to the subject, and that readers are bound to catch a portion of its enthusiasm—especially that which animates the sections on Plautus, Lucretius, Cicero, Vergil, and Livy. An admirable feature is the incorporation into the more important chapters of translations, some of them by the author himself. The sketch ends with Tacitus, and the scale allows barely ten pages for the 'Silver Age.' An 'Index to the Writers' (pp. 79-80) is a serviceable addition, though it should logically have omitted persons who were not literary figures, like Epicharis, Magia, or Milichus. There

is unfortunately no bibliography. The printer's reader ought to have corrected 'Maulius' (p. 65) and 'Tibillus' (p. 80).

The constraint of compression in so condensed a work, of course, squeezes some writers into narrow compass and squeezes others entirely out. This is simply unavoidable. Compression also militates against the employment of requisite qualifications in statement; for we can hardly claim to have 'no less than twenty-one' of Plautus' plays: we cannot strictly say that the Plautine 'heroine is always a slave-girl in the hands of a cruel slave-owner': and a tiro might easily be misled by the remark that the collection of Cicero's letters 'covers the last twenty-five years of his life,' when in fact we have only eleven letters between 68 and 65 B.C. and none at all from the years 64 and 63 B.C. Many will cordially agree with the prominence given by Professor Conway to Plautus and yet feel that Terence ought to have had fuller treatment—there is no quotation nor even a title to represent him. So too the excursus on the use of 'ego' and 'nos' in Cicero might have been with advantage curtailed in favour of a study of some other aspects of the orator's work for which no room was found.



Such criticisms, however, imply that the booklet, which after all is of the nature of an anthology, possesses the great merit and value of bearing its author's individual impress. It is compact of vigour, while its characterisation

of the greater writers and reconstitution of their background ought to win more readers for Latin literature.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Armstrong College,  
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

#### CONSTANS' GALLIC WAR.

*César, Guerre des Gaules.* Texte établi et traduit par L.-A. CONSTANS, Professeur à l'Université de Lille. Tome I (Livres I-IV), pp. xxxiii + 125 (really 250), 20 francs; Tome II (Livres V-VIII), pp. 213 (really 405), price not stated. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1926. Paper, 20 fr.

M. CONSTANS is one of the leading authorities in France on the MSS. of Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum*. He has shown (*Rev. Phil.*, January, 1926) the close connexion between the Lovaniensis collated by Rice Holmes (*C.Q.*, 1911) and the Neapolitanus first used by the Paravian editor in 1920. As is well known, the study of Caesar's text has resolved itself into a comparative valuation of two families of MSS. ever since Nipperdey separated the *codices integri* ( $\alpha$ ) from what he contemptuously called the *codices interpolati* ( $\beta$ ). The reaction in favour of  $\beta$ , so marked in Meusel's great edition of 1894, may be said to have reached its zenith in the last Teubner edition of Klotz. Recently, however, the Italian editor has returned almost to Nipperdey's position.

On account of C.'s own labours among the MSS., it is the text to which we turn first. C. is very conservative; by which it is not meant that he follows any particular manuscript tradition. Where  $\alpha$  fails he has recourse to  $\beta$ ; and, in general, he prefers the reading of any *codex deterior* to the conjecture of a modern editor. His method is essentially eclectic. We find hardly a hundred passages (excluding those in which the spelling of Gaulish names and of some Latin words is corrected) in which his text gives something not supplied by MSS., and the majority of these variants are commonly accepted restorations made by the Renaissance editors. The conservatism of this text

may be brought home by a glance at that monument of Confusion Worse Confounded, Meusel's *Tabula Coniecturarum Caesarianarum* (1893); and how much more perplexity modern ingenuity has added since that date!

We have noticed the following deviations from the MSS. In Bk. I: 16, 5 *praeerat* (Nicaise) for *praeerant*, wherein C. agrees with Rice Holmes in allowing only one annual Vergobret; 17, 2; 38, 3; 40, 13; 47, 2; 51, 1—all traditional and fairly certain corrections; 38, 5 *pedum M sexcentorum* (the suggestion of Napoleon III) for *pedum sexc.* In Bk. II C. makes a bad start. The book begins with a statement which is intended to be resumptive of, but is at variance with, the ending of Bk. I. It can be corrected, either by omitting (with most of  $\beta$ ) *in hibernis*—the simpler correction—or by an addition. C. accepts Klotz's insertion of *legionesque essent conlocatae* (?=one line of archetype), but retains the disagreement with Bk. I in his translation, using there as well the misleading tense 'prenait (. . . quand.)' This oversight of giving one text and translating another occurs several times: cf. 12, 1, where C.'s own emendation *pervenit* (for MSS. *contendit*) is translated 'se dirigea (vers),' and 28, 1, where C. adopts Glandorp's *coniectos* (from 16, 5) but translates 'rassemblés' (MSS. *collectos*). The last correction seems to press Caesar's love for rigid phrases overmuch. Notice changes also at 5, 6; 8, 3; and, in Bk. III, at 5, 1 (is the dative impossible?); 6, 4; 9, 3; 13, 8 Hotman's certain *copulis* for *scopulis*; 24, 5; 26, 3 *prorutis* (Faerno), which is spoiled by the misprint *hos* preceding it, for *proruptis*. In Bk. IV there are minor corrections in the text of 1, 9; 1, 10; 3, 3 (2); 5, 2; 6, 3; 23, 5; 25, 6; 27, 1. In 16, 6 C. adopts Lange's addition *ad praesens*, but it is hard to



say why this fell out, and it seems sufficient with Aldus to insert *ad* alone before *auxilium*. With Bentley he changes *et amicitia* in 16, 7 to *amicitiae*, but this creates an awkward string of genitives, and involves taking *opinione* in a different reference from *opinione* earlier in the sentence. The advantage of the changes in 22, 3 hardly justifies the departure from the MSS.—*quod* certainly need not be altered to the *quot* of the *editio princeps*. Familiar corrections appear in Bk. V in 9, 1; 11, 4; 24, 6; 25, 5; 28, 4; 32, 2; 47, 4; 49, 2 and 54, 1. In the corrupt passage 25, 3 C. prints Witte's *clam* for the second *iam*, which palaeographically follows *inimici* well, but makes a curious contrast in fact with *palam*; at the famous crux 31, 5 he takes sides with Hartz and Mommsen in reading *mane eatur* for MSS. *maneatur*, but this brilliant suggestion surely involves an intractable difficulty with the negative; and he is strong-minded enough to mark 34, 2 as corrupt. In Bk. VI notice 17, 3; 21, 4; 30, 2; 22, 2, where he follows Aldus in deleting after *qui* the impossible *cum*, although either *quicumque* (Peskett) or *qui tum* (Heller) seems attractive; and, in Bk. VII, 1, 1; 15, 4; 20, 3; 27, 2; 28, 1; 36, 6; 42, 6; 45, 2; 56, 2 (*ne* for the first *ut*); 64, 1; 67, 3; 68, 3; 73, 2; 73, 6; 78, 1; 82, 3; 84, 1—passages which require no comment. In 3, 2 C. adopts Schneider's *ubi quae*, which is very close to the *ubique* of the best MSS.; but is *ubicumque*, which does not involve an unusual idiom, not given by some of the *codd. dett.*? It finds no place, however, in the critical apparatus. In 50, 2 is printed Heller's excellent *pactum* for *pacatum* (the vulgar reading is *pacatorum*). There are several well-known difficulties in the Seventh Book. In 14, 5 Madvig's *ab via* is adopted for the MSS. *aboia* (vulg. *a Boia*), but does not appear in C.'s translation. Is *ab* found in Caesar before *v*? In 35, 3, where the almost universal *captis* of the MSS., in an impossible sense, has suggested to editorial fancy more conjectures than any other word in the text of the *Commentaries*, C. reads *carptis*, which is given by the second hand of l. This was also Wendel's conjecture, and, as the easiest correction, wins even a

grudging assent from Rice Holmes. In 55, 9 C. cuts the knot by reading *in provinciam* for *ex provincia*, with Nicaise. It is an excess of caution to read *†mulculos* in 84, 1, where AM have *musculos* (so, too, C.'s translation). The dagger also appears in 90, 8. In Bk. VIII observe 3, 1; 5, 2; 9, 3; 14, 4 (Nipperdey's *dividi videret* for *divideret*); 23, 5; 24, 3; 28, 2; 40, 2; 41, 4 (*venas*: Kübler, following Orosius, for *vineas*); 42, 4 (*prout erat* for *poterat*: Hoffmann); 48, 10; 52, 5.

As may be guessed from his treatment of other men's conjectures, C. is very sparing of his own. We have noticed only twenty-two corrections of his introduced into the text; and of these three (I 29, 2; V 55, 2; VII 58, 2) are concerned with the spelling of Gaulish names, three (V 6, 4; 41, 6; 49, 2) are slight transpositions, four (IV 10, 1; VI 8, 6; VII 75, 3—but Nipperdey anticipated C. here?—81, 4) are deletions, and six (I 46, 4; V 34, 4; VI 43, 1; VII 46, 1; 53, 2; 75, 3) are additions, in five cases of a single word. Of the remainder, *supplevi rebus* for *superioribus*, a brilliant attempt to restore the corrupt beginning of the Hirtian Preface to Bk. VIII, is by far the boldest stroke in the whole edition. It has the advantage of keeping A's *comparentibus*, and the alteration could have easily occurred before *atque insequentibus*. The other corrections of C.'s are in II 12, 1; VI 1, 3; VII 57, 3 (good); VIII 4, 1 and 15, 5 (*fasce* for *acie* makes a very dull sentence!).

C.'s adherence to  $\beta$  is noteworthy in III 13, 9 (*cotes*); IV 22, 3; V 42, 2 and VII 56, 2. Among passages where surely  $\alpha$  is wrongly preferred are I 43, 1 (the names in  $\alpha$  look like a gloss) and II 35, 3 (*hibernacula* is not found in Caesar). The results of an eclectic method cannot hope to win approval everywhere. C. himself says (p. xxvii) 'il faut constamment confronter les deux traditions, et, au lieu d'appliquer automatiquement un principe d'autorité reconnu une fois pour toutes, on doit juger chaque cas en lui-même, d'après le contexte, d'après l'usage de César, d'après les suggestions du sens critique. Cette méthode est d'un maniement

délicat.' In this handling C. usually shows a sane judgment.

A comment is due on the prevalent method of indicating by italics words or letters restored in the text. Consider the following: videbat (for *codd.* viderat) III 6; praeerat (for *praeerant*) I 16; constratisque (contractisque) IV 22. So far so good, a threefold rule emerges, which is clear and universal and well emphasises the smallness of the change made. But what of *facultas* (difficultas) I 38; *copulis* (scopulis) III 13; *Lato-bicorum* (atobrigorum) I 29; *Sedululus* (asedullus, sedulius) VII 88; *deduci* (deduci) III 23; *venas* (vineas) VIII 41; *iis* (his) IV 19; *iis* (his) IV 15, etc.? Could not a more consistent application of a convention be attained?

C. has taken great pains with native names. With Vendryès he prefers the form *Metlosedum*. Personal names Latinised in *-us* he regularly spells *-os* in the translation, though he has naturalised 'Camulogène.' But why does a lonely 'Sédullus' appear on p. 277 (unless de Saulcy found actual proof of a *-u-* stem on coins)?

Such a conflict as *impediebat* and *inpeditis* within the one chapter V 7, or *finitimos* and *finitumisque*, both in VI 2, strikes the eye, but is the deliberate result of following the tradition of *a* or, when *a* is in internal discord, of the majority of a MSS.

The critical apparatus is very clear and useful. C. has included in it 'the most interesting conjectures'; but it is kept within reasonable bounds—e.g. the extravagant 'restorations' of the prolific 'emender' Paul seldom appear. In corrupt passages the reader is referred

to Meusel's *Tabula*, and for C.'s views on his own conjectures to the *Rev. Études anc. and Rev. Phil.* Only twice have we found the apparatus awkwardly intruding where it should not (pp. 102 and 293).

The volumes are pleasantly and carefully printed, as one expects in this series. A close examination, however, reveals slight blemishes, which a later edition, it is hoped, will remove. Letters or figures are missing, e.g. on p. 24, title and l. 1; p. 80, l. 30; p. 132, title; p. 267, l. 15. On p. xxvii, l. 28, read *Ashburnhamianus*; p. 117, l. 27, *hiemem*; p. 151, l. 22, *perturbati*. Paragraph 3 begins in the wrong place in the text, p. 185. Undotted *i*'s abound, as many as three to a page. Our copy of Vol. I is defective by eight pages. This we should not mention if it were only an error in the folding of folio 5, but the mistake seems to be more deep-seated, and may affect the whole edition.

There is an excellent Introduction of thirty-three pages, in which C. discusses the title, the time of writing, the MSS., the style, and the historical value of the work. He rejects the year-by-year theory of composition, and adheres to the view that the *Commentaries* were hastily composed during the last three months of 52 and published immediately. There are a good Index and three maps (of Gaul, Gergovia, and Alesia). We notice *Boii* in the text and index, *Boi* in the map.

M. Constans' *César* is a worthy addition to the Budé Classics.

L. J. D. RICHARDSON.

University College,  
Cardiff.

#### THE OXFORD LIVY.

*Titi Livi Ab Vrbe Condita*. Recognoverunt et adnotatione critica instruxerunt C. F. WALTERS et R. S. CONWAY. Tomus III., Libri XXI.-XXV. Oxonii: e Typographeo Clarendoniano [1929]. Cloth, 6s. (India paper edition, 7s. 6d.)

THE Oxford Livy, as is well known, differs from the other texts in the series in containing, not a select, but an exhaustive *apparatus criticus*, and it is not

too much to say that the book before us opens a new era in the textual study of the Third Decade. It is the fruit of years of hard toil on the part of the authors (of whom Professor Walters is, alas! no longer with us) and several of their former pupils. Not only has an important MS., the *Agennensis* in the British Museum (with which the *editio princeps*, Rome 1469, seems closely connected), been employed for the first

time, but those already known have been collated with a care which has laboriously distinguished the various hands in each, and in some cases the different scribes who copied the original MS., and has approximately dated each corrector and discovered his 'personal equation.' Thus it has been possible to write the history of each *codex*, and of the Livian text as a whole. The patience and insight involved are beyond praise; and the editors have enriched their annotations with a wealth of argumentation, criticism, and reference to other authorities which will greatly increase the indebtedness of scholars. Particularly is this the case in matters of orthography, not only of common words, but of names of persons and places. It may be remarked that the *app. crit.* is substantially the work of Professor Walters, while his death left his colleague with the task of writing the preface, which, besides full descriptions of the MSS., gives an index of passages in the notes in which discussions of important points, palaeographical and other, may be found.

Unfortunately the *Puteanus*, our supreme authority, is a very corrupt uncial indeed, written, as the preface says, at a time when classical Latin was dying and Italian not yet born. The scribe, poor fellow, hardly deserves the charge of drunkenness (see XXIV. 45. 7 n.), but it is true that he can scarcely have understood more of what he was copying than three or four words at a time. The copies of P, and their would-be correctors, provide a most melancholy and yet most instructive chapter in the history of palaeographical error, wilful and otherwise. Professor Conway leaves to others two important problems for solution: (a) how it comes about that some tenth or twelfth century corrector of the *Mediceus* or *Agennensis* achieved obviously right readings where his original P was quite wrong; (b) how it is that amid much that is ludicrous and almost criminal some of the Renaissance scholars, and particularly Laurence Valla, who once worked on A, could make such palmary emendations.

We have only noted two misprints in the text—in XXIII. 35. 7 'exaequar'

for 'exaequari,' and in XXV. 36. 7 a full-stop after 'circumdabant' instead of a comma. There are several, however, in the notes—some of a bewildering kind. The recording of earlier conjectures is judicious and full, though each of us will regret the exclusion of some which he has learned to value, especially as some that are given are stigmatised as 'malae' or 'mirae.' How far the collation of P is intended to be absolutely exhaustive we cannot say; but, e.g., the following readings are not recorded—XXII. 39. 9, 'ne' for 'nec'; XXII. 39. 10, 'quae' for 'que' (after 'futura'); XXIII. 53. 7, 'esse Scipio' for 'esse' (after 'malo'); XXIII. 42. 13, 'ademdemeris' (*sic*), with the 'mde' struck out by a corrector; XXV. 15. 17, 'fortunam' for 'fortuna.' All these have been recorded by previous editors, and are quite clear in Omont's photographic reproduction. In XXII. 57. 6 P<sup>2</sup> read 'galina,' not 'gallina.' In a few cases the editors in their notes write 'scripsimus,' apparently claiming as their own emendations made before by others. We note also that in XXII. 31. 8, 9 the annalist Coelius Antipater is spelt 'Caelius' in the text without comment (elsewhere 'Coelius').

Granted the thorough preparation which we have described, the constitution of a new text is harder than might seem to be the case; how hard, is proved by the fact that the editors record at least seventy-eight instances where their opinions differ. (Of course that number would have been less but for the difficulties caused by Professor Walters' illness.) Most of the new readings now proposed are on the old lines; some seem caused by an almost perverse desire to save Livy's credit on points of fact; many are concerned with the filling of gaps, admitted or suspected, largely on the supposition of the omission in P of a line or lines of sixteen to eighteen letters. We feel a little suspicious that the editors, having proved conclusively that the scribe of P was peculiarly prone to certain types of error, unconsciously argue as if he never made any others. Granted that an emendation which assumes one of those types of error is more convincing, yet surely the human

intellect has not greatly changed in fifteen centuries, and the transcriptional slips of modern dons and undergraduates, *experto crede*, defy analysis, and in many cases even explanation.

We await eagerly the publication by

Professor Conway of the second half of the Third Decade, which, we understand, is well advanced.

E. E. GENNER.

Oriel College,  
Oxford.

### BOURGERY AND PONCHONT'S LUCAN.

*Lucain : La Guerre Civile (La Pharsale).*

Tome II, Livres VI-X. Texte établi et traduit par A. BOURGERY et MAX PONCHONT. Pp. 225 (really 432). Paris: Société d'édition 'Les belles lettres', 1929. Paper, 26 fr.

SINCE the appearance of the first half of this edition, reviewed in C.R. 1927 pp. 189-91, it has been thought advisable to make some change in the editorship, and the last three books have been put into the hands of Mr Ponchont. The former review was much too long for the importance of the work, though all too short for the number and the nature of its mistranslations. In this second half the errors are fewer and less formidable, but to notice them adequately would still need too much room; and instead of sorting them into classes I will first give a general list of the worse among them and then exhibit a single specimen from each book.

VI 139, 226 f., 301, 311, 319 f., 385, 535 f., 716 f.; VII 132, 205 f., 249, 253, 325, 365, 375 f., 395, 418, 463, 467 f., 484, 501, 518 f., 537 f., 580, 603, 705, 842, 856 f.; VIII 40 f., 52 f., 236, 246 f., 402 f., 462, 512 f., 619, 646 f., 748, 792; IX 83, 153 f., 219 f., 245, 283, 346, 365, 369, 387, 390-2, 405 f., 434, 457, 520 f., 559, 580, 593 f., 616, 667 f., 684, 852 f., 983, 992 f.; X 9 f., 184, 203, 272, 369 f., 449, 472, 502.

VI 385 *Magnetes equis, Minyae gens cognita remis*. Having mistaken a nom. plur. for a gen. sing. the editor translates *Minyae gens* 'les descendants de Minyas', bolsters up his error with the fiction 'Minyas était un des compagnons de Jason,' and puts this imaginary person into his index.

VII 375 f. *haec* (*populus futurus libera nasci*, | *haec* (*qui nunc est populus*)

*uult turba mori* 'libre cette foule veut naître, libre elle veut mourir'.

VIII 792 *inscripsit* (saxo) *sacrum semusto stipile nomen* 'il grave sur un pieu à demi consumé le nom auguste'.

IX 369 *haud ultra Garamantidas attigit undas* 'ne s'avance point au delà des eaux des Garamantes'.

X 9 f. *fertur securus in urbem* | *pignore tam saevi sceleris sua signa secutam* (which had pledged by Pompey's murder its adhesion to his cause) 'il entre, sûr du gage offert par un crime si cruel, dans la capitale, qui fait escorte à ses enseignes'.

I have chosen these rather than such blunders as VII 395 *nocte coacta* 'à la nuit noire' or 468 *percussâ* mistaken for *percussâ* because they better display the editors' incompetence as interpreters and make it the more surprising that they should so often venture to offer their own opinions in places where interpretation is the subject of dispute. Mr Bourgery even thinks that he can amend the text. X 314 'hoc fere modo restituit Bourgery: *qua iter est nostrum ad rubri commercia ponti*'. VII 156 *typhonas*: 'on pourrait lire *pithias*'. VII 309 f. 'il me verra percer mes entrailles, lui qui, vainqueur, n'avait pas jusqu'ici pitié de l'ennemi': 'what is he mistranslating now?' asks the astounded reader; but the French is faithful to the absurdity of the Latin, for the Latin is Mr Bourgery's and is this: *fodientem viscera cernit* | *me mea, qui nondum uictor respexerat hostem*.

In the notes my reference at VII 156 to 'Olympiod. in Ar. met. p. 13 14-6 ed. Berol.' has become 'Olympiodore (*Métam. d'Aratus* p. 13, 14, 16 éd. de Berlin)', and at 161 my 'Cassius Dio XLI 61 2' is transformed into 'Dion Chrysostome'. A. E. HOUSMAN.



## TWO BOOKS ON SENECA.

*Sénèque: Questions Naturelles.* Texte établi et traduit par PAUL OLTRAMARE. Tome I. (Livres I.-III.) et Tome II. (Livres IV.-VII.). (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1929. Paper, 25 frs. each volume.

*Die Nachahmungstechnik Senecas in den Chorliedern des Hercules Furens und der Medea.* Doctoral dissertation by CHRISTOS K. KAPNUKAS. Pp. x+158. Borna-Leipzig: Universitätsverlag von Robert Noske, 1930. Paper.

MR. OLTRAMARE has not only collated H, P, E and Z of the manuscripts in Class Φ, and A, B and V of those in Class Δ, but also examined G, S and F in many places, and he has been able to correct some previous reports of readings. From Gercke he has taken the readings of J, K, L, M, O, T and g. He regards H and V as the best representatives of the two classes. Of Z, preserved in his own university city of Geneva, Mr. Oltramare holds, as was seen in *Rev. Phil.* XLV., 1921, pp. 5-44, a very different view from Gercke and from Mr. Garrod, *C.Q.* VIII., 1914, p. 275, and about a hundred and forty adopted readings have no better authority. He makes rather more than seventy conjectures, of which all but ten are in the text. One of the cleverest is *ora nacta for aura tacta* at iii. 29. 6; one of the least convincing is *cadaveribus for clarus* at iii. 27. 7. Of Mr. Garrod's conjectures three are accepted, and nearly forty are to be found in the *apparatus criticus*. Mr. Oltramare makes many good choices between possible readings, but one doubts, for example, at iii. 18. 1 *illis*, which is not translated, iv. pr. 9 *ut for quod* (why not *quo*?); and iv. 2. 7 surely *aquae* (cp. i. 8. 8, ii. 26. 7, iii. 19. 1, iii. 27. 1, vi. 20. 1) or *fluminis* (cp. vi. 8. 4, vi. 20. 3) must have fallen out. Good emendations which might have been read and are not even mentioned are i. 1. 10 *ac* Brakman, iii. 15. 3 *numerus* Kroll and Kronenberg, and vi. 18. 3 *sui parat* Walter, which is better than *sibi parat* for *superat*; and one misses i. 3. 4 *ut . . . desinat* Gercke and in a Paris manuscript, i. 6. 6 *naturae*, and

i. 13. 2 *quin* F. Muller, i. 16. 5 *quem non est quod non putes* Walter, iv. 13. 1 *memet* Brakman, vi. 18. 3 *liberat aestum* Walter, and vii. 30. 1 *diuinis* apud Roger Bacon. At iii. 18. 3 *serpentis* was proposed by Kroll in 1911, and at vii. 25. 3 *sol* was added by Burgersdijk in 1899. At v. 17. 5 one half of Vasi's proposal is given without the other; he alters *ferunt* to *furunt*. At i. 3. 4 *sed* is omitted on the authority of Z, but *sed nunc* is in Juv. v. 141 and Seneca does not always use *nunc* by itself for 'as it is'; cp., for example, at *nunc* iv. 2. 25 and *Ad Marciam* 20. 4, *nunc uero* iv. 2. 3 and vi. 6. 3, *nunc autem* vii. 18. 1, and *nunc tamen* at *Ad Helviam* 18. 9. At iii. 27. 14 it is not clear why, when it is said that Z 'a sans doute raison,' its reading is not in the text.

Mr. Oltramare gives brief introductions to each book and a good preface to the whole work. The original order of the books is regarded as iv. b—vii., i.—iv. a. The translation is clear and accurate and, for the most part, concise. It was perhaps inevitable that in iii. 30. 5 four Latin words should need sixteen in French, but at iv. 2. 6 need *planis aquis tradit* have become 'il les remet sains et saufs à des eaux tranquilles'? It is probably due to a praiseworthy endeavour to be brief that words have been omitted at i. 3. 8, ii. 16, ii. 49. 2, ii. 59. 12, vi. 2. 3, vi. 2. 9, vi. 5. 2, vi. 32. 3, and vi. 32. 7.

Mr. Oltramare adds a generous number of explanatory notes, which form a valuable and illuminating commentary. They cannot all find room at the foot of the page and some of them fill four or five pages at the end of each volume, where there might perhaps be room for a few more in a new edition. i. pr. 11 *contentus modico* is not in Suet. *Tib.* 18, but it is in Juv. ix. 9; i. 8. 8 Luc. iv. 81 is not necessarily an imitation of Virg. *Georg.* i. 380, for cp. Plaut. *Curc.* 132. ii. 3. 2 Mr. Oltramare notes *pabula laeta* at iii. 27. 5 as a Lucretianism—it is seven times in Lucr., but also, for example, in *Cul.* 45 and *Ov. Am.* iii. 5. 28—and *aperitius faciam*, with which cp. *Ep.* 58. 19, may come from Lucr. ii. 182. ii. 31. 1 cp. Luc. vii. 159 and Sil. Ital. xii. 625-6.

ii. 40. 2 does not agree with *Ep.* 57. 8. iii. pr. 3 cp. *Hor. Odes* ii. 16. 17-18. iii. 18. 4 the mullet likes rocks again in *Juv.* v. 93. v. 18. 8 cp. *Prop.* iii. 7. 31-2. vi. 3. 4 cp. *Manil.* iv. 407. vi. 32. 12 cp. *Ep.* 77. 19. At i. 1. 13 it is said 'Castor et Pollux sont les dieux protecteurs des hommes de mer. Horace (*C.* i. 3. 1 sqq.) et Pline (*N.H.* ii. 101) ajoutent aux Dioscures leur sœur Hélène.' The only reference to Helen in the ode of Horace is in verse two, which describes the Dioscouri as *fratres Helenae, lucida sidera*, and in Pliny Helen is as dangerous to ships as her brothers are kindly. Compare also *Stat. Silvae* iii. 2. 8-12 and *Theb.* vii. 791-3.

I have noticed more than a hundred misprints in these two volumes. It is a pity there are so many, but almost all are trivial and easily put right—it need only be noted that on p. 97 the 'bons manuscrits' have not *hominem* but *hominum* and that K. Busche is consistently referred to as Busch—and they do not lessen the gratitude Mr. Oltramare deserves for having produced so convenient an edition of a work in which, as he says, Seneca shows himself 'un éminent représentant de l'humanité romaine, et même de l'humanité en général.'

Kapnukajas' work—'die für den Vorläufer einer Abhandlung über sämtliche Chorlieder der Tragödien Senecas gehalten werden soll'—is dedicated to the *manes* of Richard Heinze by a pupil of his at Leipzig from Siatista in south-west Macedonia. It gives a commentary on the odes of the *H.F.* and *Medea* together with discussion of the sources on which Seneca has drawn and of his method in using them. It is shown that he borrows from Euripides, Virgil, and Horace, but that his chief debt is to Ovid and especially to his *Metamorphoses*, and that what he borrows he makes his own. For the most part Mr. Kapnukajas does not ask us to believe in fanciful instances of imitation, but sometimes the wisdom is forgotten that may be learned from Hosius' *De imitatione scriptorum Romanorum imprimis Lucani* (Greifswald, 1907), and in a few places some modification is necessary.

The similarity of *Med.* 303 and *Ov.*

*Trist.* iii. 10. 61-62, of 584 and *Met.* xiii. 725, and of *H.F.* 1087-8 and *Lucr.* iv. 769 and 1023 (cp. *Ciris* 340) is probably without significance. At *H.F.* 133 for *Oeta* cp. *H.O.* 861-2 and *Ciris* 350; 143 add *Virg. Georg.* ii. 524-5; 145 add *Virg.* with *Hor. Odes* iii. 16. 28 cp. also *Sen. Ecl.* iii. 55; 165 add *Tib.* i. 1. 56; 168 *Ep.* 73. 4; 172 cp. *Ov. Trist.* iii. 12. 18 *uerbosi fori*; 174 *locant* in *Ov. Fasti* v. 293 is used of the other party, and compare rather *Am.* i. 10. 30 and *Juv.* viii. 185; 182 *retro reuoluunt* cp. *Ag.* 488-9; 198 cp. *Tib.* i. 10. 40; 199 cp. *Hor. Ep.* i. 7. 58 and *Odes* iii. 29. 14; 533 add *Aesch. P.V.* 709-710; 568 add *Virg. Aen.* iii. 383; 574 add *Prop.* iii. 2. 3-4; 580 cp. *Claud. In Ruf.* ii. 494 *ueteresque reos*; 581 *uiridici* is probably not simply 'aus metrischer Bequemlichkeit' but for the assonance with *Eurydici*; 865 cp. *H.O.* 48-49 and 1527; 866 *cum semel* is not necessarily due to *Hor. Odes* iv. 7. 21 for *cp. Prop.* iv. 11. 3; 874 *prima hora* a closer parallel is *De Prouid.* v. 7; 1110-1 should have been kept—cp. *C.Q.* V., 1911, p. 109; *Med.* 59 *scepтрifer* may be from *Ov. Fasti* vi. 480; 66 *Hor. Odes* i. 19. 16 is worth citing; 100 add *Ov. Fasti* ii. 149; 111 for the metonymy add *Virg. Aen.* vii. 397, *Ciris* 439 and *H.F.* 101 and for *multifidam* *Ov. Met.* viii. 644; 315 cp. *Germ. Aratea* 139 *tardus in occasum sequitur sua plaustra Bootes*; 334 add *Ov. Met.* vii. 52 and *Sen. N.Q.* v. 18. 14; 339 *sepositum* cp. *Prop.* i. 20. 24; 373-4 the expression is not only Horatian—cp. *Virg. Ecl.* i. 62 and *Aen.* viii. 715 to say nothing of *Homer, Il.* ii. 825; 376 cp. *Ad Marciam* 18. 6 and *Sen. rhet. Suas.* i. 4. 595, where *Hor. Odes* i. 2. 30 is not an exact parallel since *ueniam* is a noun and *uenias* comes from *uenire*, cp. *Virg. Aen.* iii. 144; 637 add *H.O.* 283; 661 why is no consideration taken of *C.Q.* XVII., 1923, p. 167? 663 the true reading is *Gronouius' impendes*, but Mr. Kapnukajas, although at 304 he has quoted *impedens animam marito*, here, attributing *impendet* to Gruter, reads the unlikely verse *uxor impendet animam marito*; 666 Mr. Kapnukajas explains the aesthetic value of *ustus* forgetting that Richter's arrangement of this passage, which he has told us at 657 he is following, involves the expulsion of the

verse to which the word is thought to belong; 863 add *Ov. Met.* xiii. 547. It is worth mentioning that Mr. Kapnukajas rejects the view of Mesk, adopted by Weinreich, that the last ode of the *H.F.* is in the form of the rhetorical λόγος ἐπιτάφιος.

The book is not free from misprints

and wrong references, and twice an American is described as an Englishman; but Mr. Kapnukajas has written an interesting and largely persuasive work that makes us look forward to the results of his future studies.

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

*University of Liverpool.*

### THE GREEK FATHERS.

*The Greek Fathers.* By J. M. CAMPBELL. London: Harrap, 1929. Pp. ix + 167. Cloth, 5s. net.

THIS spirited and interesting volume in the American series 'Our Debt to Greece and Rome' is the work of a Professor of Greek and Latin in the Catholic University of America at Washington. He is true to the purpose of the series, selecting for summary treatment those of the Fathers from Irenaeus to John of Damascus who have exercised an influence upon Western thought. The Apostolic Fathers are omitted, and also the Apologists, as not Hellenic, and as having failed to leave their mark. Likewise, certain pure theologians, and notably the two Cyrils, are omitted. The West is regarded as having worked out its doctrine independently of them. But the chief writers are admirably treated, Dr. Campbell's favourites being, it seems, Origen, Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Areopagite, while due emphasis is laid upon the importance of John of Damascus as the guide of the Scholastics into Greek metaphysical theology. Almost half of the little book is occupied in tracing the channels by which Eastern thought reached the Christian West, and the ways in which it worked. It was St. Augustine who did most to convey it, and he who superseded it. Yet

Western monasticism was shaped by translations from the Greek, and Dionysius the Areopagite, in several rival translations, was to stamp his Neoplatonism upon Western philosophy. Dr. Campbell shows how great was the influence of Greek Christian eloquence on the French preachers of the seventeenth century, and how in other ways modern literature has been affected from the same source, till finally the historical school of the nineteenth century drew attention to the primitive Christian writers who hitherto had been comparatively neglected. It is not surprising that he has failed to note how Greek thought has influenced the English more deeply than any other of the reformed Churches. It reached us *quo pruna et cottana vento*. Young Fellows of Colleges in both the Universities were eager to serve as chaplains in the Levant, and they returned laden not only with manuscripts for collectors such as Usher and Laud, but with ideas of doctrine and of worship that were novel and attractive in the seventeenth century.

This pleasant little book has been insufficiently revised for the press. The unlearned will be in doubt whether Nazianzus was a person or a place.

E. W. WATSON.

*Christ Church, Oxford.*

### SOME CLASS-BOOKS.

*Platon. Verteidigungsrede des Sokrates: Kriton.* By CRON-UHLE-STRUCK. Pp. iv + 132. Leipzig: Teubner, 1929. Boards, Rm. 4.80 (unbound, 4.20).

THIS is a revision of Cron-Uhle's *Apology* and *Crito* by Dr. Struck. The Introduction is entirely rewritten: it

leads up to a discussion of Socrates and his trial by a brief discussion of σοφοί, σοφισταί, φιλόσοφοι: it is interestingly written, but contains nothing strikingly new or controversial. The notes, usually excellent, are at times overcrowded with comments on the obvious,

occasionally to the exclusion of what is important: e.g. 29A δοκεῖν γὰρ εἰδέναι ἐστίν, ἃ οὐκ οἶδεν has the superfluous note ἃ οὐκ οἶδεν, *nāml.* ὁ δοκῶν εἰδέναι, without observing the distinction between ἃ οὐκ οἶδεν (Lat. *quae nescit*), 'ignorance on the particular subject,' viz. death, and ἃ μὴ οἶδα a few lines below (Lat. *quae nesciam*), 'subjects in general on which I am ignorant': 24B πολλή γὰρ ἂν τις εὐδαιμονία εἴη, *τις* is taken with the noun and compared in the note with 23D ὡς Σωκράτης *τίς* ἐστὶ μιαιώτατος, where the note takes *τις* as modifying the adjective: it would surely be better, as well as more consistent with the reference to 23D, to take πολλή *τις* together: 26E δραχμῆς ἐκ τῆς ὀρχήστρας πριαμένοις—three interpretations are suggested, but the editor does not state clearly which he prefers, unless he does so by implication by answering the objections raised to the view that the reference is to doctrines aired in the choruses of tragedies: 26D ὥστε οὐκ εἰδέναι—'in der Regel steht bei ὥστε mit dem Infin. *μή*, doch auch *οὐ*, besonders wenn ὥστε sich an einen von φάναι, οἶσθαι u. dgl. abhängigen Infin. anschliesst' does not suggest how very exceptional ὥστε *οὐ* with the infin. is except in O.O.: 36C ἐνταῦθα μὲν οὐκ ἦα οἱ ἐλθὼν μήτε ὑμῖν μήτε ἐμαυτῷ ἑμελλον μηδὲν ὀφελος εἶναι no explanation is given of the difficult μήτε: 27E καὶ οὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μήτε δαίμονας κ.τ.λ. the editor quotes with approval O. Apelt's comparison of this *οὐ* with the redundant *οὐ* in ἐστὶ τοι οὐδεμία μηχανὴ μὴ οὐκ ἀπολωλέναι κάκιστα γυναικῶν πασέων (Hdt. II. 181)—but surely the *οὐ* of οὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ cannot be brought under any category of Greek idiom: it is either a copyist's error or bad Greek.

*Aspects of Greek Life.* Edited by R. C. MARTIN and A. N. G. RICHARDS. Pp. 116. London: Mills and Boon, 1929. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

A HUNDRED AND FORTY passages of Greek are here grouped under such headings as War, Love, Athletics and the like: no notes or comment of any kind are added. The extracts are well chosen: but the preface says the book is designed for the 'highest forms' in

schools. It is not called a book of 'unseen translation,' but, unless this is its intention, its function is not obvious: surely the 'highest forms' are not to do their reading in gobbets of this description. The book is disfigured by some bad readings—δθ' for ἴν', ἔστασαν for ἔστασαν (both in 101)—and many misprints—'Αλαύη for 'Αγαυή (2), ἀλάκοιεν for ἀλάλοκοιεν (56), βαρκαίοις for Βαρκαίοις (101), τέκωσεν for τέκνωσεν (122), ἰδῶν for ἰδών: whilst the wrong accents and breathings are legion—there are nine in a short passage of fourteen lines (No. 4).

*Selections from Herodotus.* By AMY L. BARBOUR. Pp. ix + 388; four maps. Boston (U.S.A.), London, etc.: Heath and Co., 1929. Cloth.

THESE selections form a continuous narrative down to the battle of Salamis, including certain of the more important and interesting digressions, but omitting large tracts of Oriental history. The design is excellent and admirably carried out: the selection contains most that the lover of Herodotus would hope to find within 200 pages of text: the notes are clear and to the point. The Introduction is devoted mainly to a brief account of the dialect of Herodotus and to Greek syntax: the latter calls itself 'The Syntax of Herodotus,' but is in reality a self-sufficing survey of Greek syntax in general. It is on the whole good: but it omits, and even denies by implication, an idiom which happens to be more frequent in Herodotus than in any other Greek author, viz. the 'time' significance of the aorist in the subjunctive and optative: § 97 says 'the tenses of these moods do not express differences of time,' a statement contained in many books on Greek syntax, never true and nowhere less true than in Herodotus. Witness p. 111, l. 14 τὰ τόξα οἱ ἐκτημένοι, ἐπεὰν μὲν δέωνται χρᾶσθαι, ἐντανύουσι, ἐπεὰν δὲ χρήσωνται, ἐκλύουσι, where the aorist subjunctive obviously means 'when they have used them': so, too, in the optative—p. 191, l. 8 ὅπως στυππεῖον περὶ τοὺς δίστους περιθέντες ἄψειαν, ἐτόξευον ἐς τὸ φράγμα where the aorist optative of indefinite fre-



quency implies *completed* action like the *pluperfect* indicative in Latin, over which a similar misunderstanding is common in Latin Grammars. The note on p. 62, l. 30 ὡς νενικημένος contains a curious confusion of thought, and one or two misprints might be corrected in a future edition—τοὺτους (110, l. 12), ἀπέφυγε for ἀπέφηνε (111, l. 27, n.), ἐκτείνω for ἐντείνω (111, l. 16, n.); but these are slight blemishes in a book which deserves warm commendation.

*Latin Prose Composition.* By E. C. MARCHANT and G. WATSON. Pp. ix + 284. London: G. Bell, 1929. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

THIS book is designed to carry on the student from the point at which Bell's *Concise Latin Course*, Part I., ends; presumably, though it is not definitely stated, it is to cover two years to matriculation standard. The method and arrangement are excellent—a few rules clearly worded, followed by an ample supply of exercise sentences: occasional continuous pieces throughout and a group at the end: each exercise has its own vocabulary, and there is a complete vocabulary as well. A second edition might remedy one or two minor points: p. 61 'with the object of' is not given in the exercise vocabulary (29): p. 95 'impersonal verbs' do not include *decet*, *libet*, *iuvat*, but *placet* is given for 'it pleases': p. 204 'Caesar often uses a case of *is* instead of *se*, etc., in a subordinate sentence in O.O. to refer to the subject of the main verb, if *se* would be ambiguous'—this, even if it were true, would not be worth saying at this stage: p. 224 'on arriving there, Torquatus shut the gates and attempted to defend the town'—the person who 'arrived' is Caesar, not Torquatus!

*Readings from Tacitus. Germanicus.* Edited by ALEXANDER DUTHIE. Pp. 86. London: Harrap and Co. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

THE design of this series is to provide volumes 'suitable to the various stages from the second to the fourth or fifth year': each volume aims at a standard, within itself, of uniform difficulty, making it suitable for one stage of

Latin. The idea is excellent, and the present choice of subject a happy one, but no indication is given as to the stage for which it is designed—presumably, from its choice of author, for the fifth year. In that case the notes are not very appropriate, as they consist almost entirely of 'tags' of translation or comment: 'dissentire manifestus,' 'openly showed his ill-will' (p. 64), 'rupturus' = 'perrupisset' (p. 61), are not very illuminating: "'parum constitit," "it was not clear"—there were said to be spots on it' (p. 65), is apt to be misunderstood: 'haud facile quis numerum inierit'—the polite use of the perfect subjunctive (p. 66), 'asperrimo hiemis'—*sc.* 'tempore' (p. 68), 'ubi colonias transgrederentur'—'would be *plup. indic.* in Cicero and Caesar' (p. 67), and 'Tiberio et Augusta cohibitam'—'the addition of the letter *e* to Augusta would change the construction to the dative of the agent' (p. 67), suggest that the editor's scholarship is not quite equal to the task of editing Tacitus.

*The Shorter Livy.* Books XL.-XLV. By A. C. B. BROWN. Pp. xxi + 183. London: Bell, 1929. Cloth, 3s. (without vocabulary, 2s. 6d.).

THESE books are mainly concerned with the war with Macedon terminated by the battle of Pydna. The volume conforms to the type of the 'Shorter Classics' series, containing a brief résumé of the omitted portions, and contains a short but adequate account of Livy and his style and of the historical setting of the story: the notes are excellent, scholarly and to the point.

*Livy.* Book XXV. Edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary, by W. D. MONRO. Pp. viii + 183; illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

THE main events of this book are the fall of Syracuse, the siege of Capua, and the destruction of the Scipios in Spain—one of the most interesting books of Livy. Introduction and notes are good and appropriate in scope, and the form of the book makes it a pleasure to use: paper and type are excellent, and it is

embellished with a number of beautiful photographs of scenery that add greatly to its interest.

*A Book of Latin Letters.* By R. G. C. LEVENS. Pp. xxii + 174. London: Methuen, 1930. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

THIS selection is drawn almost entirely from Cicero and his correspondents, Pliny, and Marcus Aurelius and Fronto. A short and admirable introduction deals first with the mechanism of letter-writing and delivery in the Roman world, and secondly with some literary and historical aspects of the great letter-writers whose correspondence is represented in the collection. The notes are very good, the historical notes and brief introductions to individual

letters particularly so. It is altogether a scholarly piece of work.

*Cicéron est intéressant.* By L. LAURAND. Pp. 60. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1929. Paper, 6 fr.

A SPIRITED plea for the study of Cicero on grounds personal, historical and literary. A short summary of the importance and diversity of his matter is followed by an acute analysis of his style, and M. Laurand finally deals with Cicero's relations with Pompey: he rates Pompey much higher than is the current fashion, and maintains that even in the Civil War his strategy was altogether sound.

H. WILLIAMSON.

*Bedford College, London.*

#### ROMAN TOPOGRAPHY.

*A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome.* By SAMUEL BALL PLATNER. Completed and revised by THOMAS ASHBY. Pp. xxiii + 608; 56 illustrations on plates, 7 text-figures, and a plan of Ancient Rome. Oxford: Humphrey Milford, 1929. Cloth, 35s. net.

*Undersökningar i Roms Topografi.* By VILH. LUNDSTRÖM. Pp. vi + 137; 38 text-figures. (Svenskt Arkiv för Humanistiska Avhandlingar, II.) Göteborg: Eranos' Förlag, 1929. Paper, 6 kr.

INTEREST in Roman topography is now at a higher level than at any time since the beginning of the last period of the excavation of the Forum which started in 1898 under the direction of the late Commendatore Giacomo Boni. Take up at random a copy of an illustrated weekly paper, and it is not unlikely that you will find in it some fresh revelation of the buildings of ancient Rome; penetrate into a scholar's library, and you will (or should) see that the last quarter of a century has left its mark upon the shelves reserved for Roman topography.

Platner and Ashby's *Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* is the result of admirable co-operation between British and American scholarship. It

is a work of supreme value and will remain so for many years. In view of its size and nature (it tips the kitchen scales at over 4 lbs. and contains over 600 pages) a detailed appreciation is out of the question, and the writer of this review will be content if he is able to emphasize the importance of a very remarkable feat of scholarship. Before 1914 the late Professor Platner, whose book *The Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome*, first published in 1904 and revised in 1911, was the most useful guide to the subject then available, had invited Dr. Ashby to collaborate with him in the compilation of a Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome. By June, 1920, Platner had unaided, for Dr. Ashby's co-operation had been rendered impossible by the War, completed about nine-tenths of the work. Since, however, Platner's death in 1921 left to Dr. Ashby the task of the completion of the copy and its preparation for press, the latter's responsibility was not confined to the compilation of articles upon aqueducts, gates, roads, and special sites in the Forum and Palatine, but covered the checking of the whole text, the verification of references, and the incorporation of the results of recent discovery and research. Dr. Ashby, while admitting personal responsibility

for about one-quarter of the whole work, is not slow to recognize the debt of gratitude which he owes to Professor Hülsen, now the doyen of Roman topographers, and to several distinguished British, American, and Italian scholars who have shown keen interest and lent willing aid. The names of all who have co-operated are a further guarantee of the book's authority.

During the present century the study of Roman topography has been marked no less by an improvement in the methods of interpreting monuments than by striking discoveries. Great progress has been made in the study of technique and of building materials. In the first place, the old criteria for dating brick-faced concrete were entirely upset by the discovery that mere measurements of the thickness of the bricks and of the courses of the mortar were not sufficient data, and that it was essential to study also the composition of the concrete and the use of older material. It was by the late Commendatore Boni and others that investigations upon the use of older material were first carried out. Moreover, pioneer work of the greatest value was undertaken by Dr. Esther B. Van Deman, whose papers in the *American Journal of Archaeology* and whose special articles upon such complex remains as the Atrium Vestae and the Sullan Forum are an example to others to follow where she has led. More recently, also, Professor Tenney Frank has followed up the earlier work of Delbrück upon the dating of *opus quadratum*, and in his *Roman Buildings of the Republic* has thrown light upon the dating of many monuments whose history had previously been obscure. But, although it cannot be said that anything like finality has been reached or is likely to be reached in the dating of many monuments, particularly of *opus quadratum*, there is surely much hope that improved methods of study, particularly of the technique of building and of architectural decoration, and the progress which is being made in the recovery and preservation of ancient remains in Rome, will combine to produce results of great interest to historians and archaeologists. Although the time has not yet come for the publi-

cation of a complete treatise upon Roman topography, the work which is being carried out by Professor Bartoli upon the results of Boni's excavations in the Forum and Palatine and the revision of the *Forma Urbis Romae* published by Lanciani in 1893-1901 will be striking contributions towards that aim.

No one who undertakes a piece of research upon any department of the topography of ancient Rome can afford to neglect the guidance of this Dictionary. The fullest references are given to ancient and modern literature, and in those numerous cases where there are divergences of opinion between authorities, readers will find conflicting views adequately and fairly summarized and a definite judgment given. In particular the articles upon such complex topics as the Mons Palatinus, the Servian Wall and the Rostra Augusti, to mention a few out of many, illustrate this essential feature. The list of Addenda et Corrigenda, which concerns 122 topics, is a testimony to the pace at which topographical literature increases in volume and also to that desire for completeness and accuracy which, if I may say so, is so characteristic of the surviving author. I may also be permitted to express commendation of the Chronological Index to Dateable Monuments, and of the selection of admirable illustrations. What few misprints I have noticed are probably all known and will disappear in a second edition. Dictionaries are not supposed to be readable, but I feel that many who may in the first instance turn to this Dictionary purely as a book of reference will later find themselves tempted to increase their intimacy with a fascinating volume which makes an important appeal to every student of Roman topography, be he recruit or veteran. The production of the book is excellent and its price is not excessive. This Dictionary is a testimony to the value of international co-operation in archaeological research and a plea for the closest liaison between students of Roman antiquities.

Some of the difficulties presented by the *Forma Urbis Romae*, many of which must await their chance of solution until more fragments have been unearthed

from the débris at the south-east corner of the Forum Pacis, are discussed by a Swedish scholar, Vilhelm Lundström, of Göteborg, in a book entitled *Undersökningar i Roms Topografi*. In his four chapters he grapples with a number of difficulties presented by the topography of Regio V. (Esquiliae) and of the Campus Martius. His first theme is the question of the location of the Amphitheatrum castrense. Abandoning the usual view that it is to be identified with the elliptical structure near the church of S. Croce in Gerusalemme, which was utilized as part of the line of the Aurelian Wall, he boldly identifies this structure with the Ludus matutinus, a gladiatorial training school of unknown site, and places the Amphitheatrum castrense just south of the Castra praetoria. He then examines the problem of the relationship between the Saepta and the Diribitorium (a building in the Campus Martius in which the votes cast by the people in the Saepta were counted by diribitores, or tellers).

Although these two buildings are mentioned (Cass. Dio lvi. 24) as if they were separate, Hülsen proposes that the Diribitorium should be regarded as the upper story of the Saepta. Lundström, however, identifies as a remnant of the Diribitorium a massive archway flanked by engaged half-columns to be seen on the level of the street in the Via dei Calderari. In his last two chapters he proposes certain re-arrangements of the fragments of the *Forma Urbis* relating to that part of the Campus Martius containing the Aedis Herculis Musarum, the Iseum, and the Serapeum. The author has clearly mastered the voluminous literature dealing with his subjects and has produced a book which must command the attention of all who are specially interested in the Campus Martius and the Esquiliae. Thirty-eight judiciously chosen illustrations (unfortunately not indexed) help those who are not familiar with Swedish to follow his main theses.

R. GARDNER.

#### RECENT COMPOSITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS.

- (1) *Carmina Hoesuffiana*. Edidit Academia Regia Disciplinarum Nederlandica, Amstelodami, 1927, 1928, 1929.
- (2) GENNARO ASPRENO ROCCO: *Carmi latini editi ed inediti*, scelti e pubblicati con un saggio introduttivo su l'autore a cura di Nunzio Coppola e con prefazione del Prof. Nicolò Festa. Milan, etc.: Società editrice Dante Alighieri, 1929. Paper, L. 25.
- (3) *A New Presentation of Greek Art and Thought: The Handwork of a Hellenist*. By F. P. B. OSMASTON, with . . . an introduction by H. W. Nevinson. London: Simpkin Marshall, n.d. 10s. 6d. net.
- (4) *The Gaisford Greek Prize Composition for 1929*. By N. K. HUTTON. Glasgow: Jackson, Wylie and Co., 1929. 2s. 6d. net.
- (5) *The Funeral Oration of Pericles translated out of Thucydides*. By THOMAS HOBBS. London: Milford (Oxford University Press), 1929. Boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- (6) *The Collects Proper to the Sundays and Holy Days of the Christian Year . . .* Rendered into Latin Verse by REGINALD WALTER MACAN. Oxford: Blackwell, 1928. Boards, 21s. net.
- (7) E. H. BLAKENEY: *Hymns of the Western Church*. The Latin text, with a Verse Rendering of each Hymn, a brief Introduction, Commentary, and Appendices. Pp. xviii + 104. London: Eric Partridge Ltd., Scholarly Press, 1930. Cloth, 16s. net.
- (1) THE prize poems in *certamine poetico Hoesuffiano* are *Vestalis*, by Hermann Weller, and *Mater Jesu et Mater Judae*, by Alessandro Zappata: 'highly commended', *Prope Galaesum*, by Adolfo Gandiglio; *Arvernus*, by Adhémar d'Alès; *Lucius*, by Hermann Weller; *Quattuor anni tempora*, by Giovanni Mazza; *Ad astra*, by Hermann Weller; and *Res multum dissonae verbis*, by Alfredo Bartoli. These reach a very fair standard, though they have the correctitude of (I will not say a corpse, but) a marble



statue rather than that of a living body. They are all beautifully printed by Enschedé at Haarlem, and on the whole correctly. It is a puzzle, but not, I think, an insoluble one, to know how, in Sig. Bartoli's poem, the strange line came about—*esse, empty in Colchis incun- dior gratior alite Romae*.

(2) Here is something more life-like. Rocco was a priest of the Neapolitan district, born in 1853: he seemed at first by his learning destined for advancement in the Church, but in some unexplained way offended his ecclesiastical superiors, and was in 1886 placed in charge of a rather disagreeable little parish called Casaréa, under the shadow of Vesuvius, and left there for the rest of his career. He gave up his cure of souls in 1912 and returned to his native village of Afragola, where he died in 1922. Through the whole of his life he poured out an enormous mass of Latin verse (this large octavo of 360 pages by no means represents all of it) in various metres and on the most diverse subjects—epics, elegies, satires, dramas, epigrams, hymns—and of a quite high order of merit. There are a few technical imperfections, but Latin was a very real and living language to him, and most of it can be read with pleasure. Italy is the only country, other than our own, where the tradition of writing Latin verse has flourished continuously, and the Abate Rocco is a pleasing specimen of this tradition.

(3) Mr. Osmaston spent the leisure of a busy life in copying some of the best known Choruses of the Attic drama with translations, and decorating them with designs from Greek masterpieces—coins, vases, sculptures, etc.

(4) is a Theocritean rendering of a passage from W. B. Yeats's *The Wild Swans at Coole*, by Mr. N. K. Hutton, scholar of University College, Oxford.

(5) The text from Thucydides, nicely set up in a handsome Greek fount, followed by Hobbes's translation.

(6) A charming little book, beautifully printed in a limited edition signed

by the author. The text of the collects is printed on the left-hand page, the translation on the right into various medieval metres—a few in more classical style. If I have any criticism, it is that the medieval pieces are sometimes rather too classical in phrase and thought, and that Dr. Macan rather often allows himself an *enjambement* from stanza to stanza, which is rare in the Latin hymn-writers. As an example of this, and of his best, simple style, may be given the collect for Lady Day ('We beseech Thee, O Lord, pour Thy grace into our hearts' . . .):

Supplices a Te quaesumus,  
qui, nuntiante angelo,  
naturam hominis tuo  
sumptam fuisse a filio

Jesu Christo cognovimus:  
infunde tuam, Dominus,  
nobis in corda gratiam,  
ut ejus crux et passio

conducant nos ad gloriam  
coelestem, per vitam novam  
ejusdem tui Filii  
renatos, redemptos, Tibi.

(7) Mr. Blakeney has printed what are, in his opinion, the twenty-four best Latin hymns, with the best English translations; and half of the latter are, as might be expected, Dr. Neale's. He discusses authorship and text, and adds explanatory notes, with a deep scholarship reasonably restrained, and with a useful quantity of references to books where they are more critically set forth; and he shows himself in his modest selection a man of taste, piety, and learning. His publisher believes (if we may judge from the dust-wrapper) that he has printed the English *opposite* the Latin. This is not so; for more than half the book it is necessary to turn the page to find the English rendering. The typography and lay-out are generally beautiful; and I have noticed but one misprint—*molestis* for *molestiis* (p. 30) in the fifth stanza of Abelard's *O quanta qualia*.

S. GASELEE.

## SOME VERSE TRANSLATIONS.

*The Oresteia translated into English Rhyming Verse.* By GILBERT MURRAY. Pp. 266. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1928. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

*Euripides, Iphigenia in Aulis translated into English Verse.* By F. MELIAN STAWELL. Pp. viii+128. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1929. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

*The Odes of Bacchylides in English Verse.* By ARTHUR S. WAY, Litt.D. Pp. vii+63. London: Macmillan, 1929. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

*Les Fragments d'Épicharme traduits en français* par RICHARD JOHNSON WALKER et illustrés par ALBERT A. BENOIS. Pp. 78. Nice: L'Éclaireur de Nice, n.d. Cloth.

*The Aeneid of Virgil in English Verse.* By ARTHUR S. WAY, Litt.D. Vol. III., Books VII.-IX.; Vol. IV., Books X.-XII. Pp. 141, 165. London: Macmillan, 1929, 1930. Cloth, 5s. net each.

*The Aeneid of Virgil literally rendered into English Blank Verse with the Text opposite.* By T. H. DELABÈRE MAY. (The Broadway Translations.) Pp. 623. London: G. Routledge, n.d. Cloth and vellum, 12s. 6d. net.

*The Comedies of Terence translated into English.* By F. PERRY. Pp. viii+366. Oxford University Press, 1929. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net. [The *Phormio* separately. Pp. viii+58. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.]

THE continual stream of translations of the Classics which issues from the press bears witness at once to the fascination exercised upon scholars by the problem of rendering the masterpieces of Greece and Rome into a modern language, and to the demand which exists for such translations among those who cannot read the originals.

No translator has done greater service than Professor Murray in making known the works of the Greek dramatists to Greekless readers. The volume before us collects the translations of the three plays of the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus which have already appeared separately. (The *Agamemnon* and the *Choephoroe* have al-

ready been noticed in this journal, C.R. XXIV., 1921, p. 107, and XXXVIII., 1924, p. 172.) A new introduction forms an admirable commentary on the plot of the trilogy. It is a truism to say that a translation of an ancient poet can at best only approximately express the spirit of the original, but no one can read a page of Professor Murray's versions without recognising the work of a scholar and of a poet. It may be questioned whether Professor Murray's use of rhymed couplets for rendering the iambic passages is really so effective as the more conventional blank verse, particularly if the play is to be acted: it certainly leads occasionally to such unnecessary expansions as '*In haste this great Parnassus to possess/ and Delphi throned in the wilderness for* ἐς τήνδε γαίαν ἦλθε Παρνησοῦ θ' ἔδρας (*Eum.* II).

Miss Stawell's scholarly translation of the *Iphigenia in Aulis* appears in the same format as Professor Murray's translations of Euripides, but she differs from him in using blank verse instead of rhymed couplets. Professor Murray writes a preface in which he points out that this play, with its ingenious non-traditional plot and its interest in the clash of individual characters, forms a half-way house between the drama as a religious ritual and the drama as an entertainment in the New Comedy. Miss Stawell's introduction gives an admirable summary of the problems which arise about the composition of the play. The doubtful passages are relegated to an appendix, and the translation with these omissions is well adapted for performance. A singing version of some of the choruses is printed at the end with appropriate airs from Gluck's opera.

The Classics have no more industrious translator than Dr. Way. His version of Bacchylides can be recommended as giving an admirable idea of some of the most pleasing Greek lyrics which have come down to us. Scholars may perhaps wish that Dr. Way had followed the precedent of some of his other translations and given the text opposite

his version; he is presumably following Jebb when he does not tell us that he is doing otherwise.

Mr. Walker has translated 318 fragments of Epicharmus into French verse. Only some dozen fragments are of any real importance; the rest are mostly single phrases or words. Mr. Walker promises a second instalment containing the text, and a third on the art of Epicharmus and the comedy of his day. M. Benois's woodcuts are hardly attractive: the best of them represents two pigs and illustrates *Fr.* 176, *ὄνος ὄνφ καλλιστόν ἐστιν, ὃς δ' οὐ*. Mr. Walker's translation of this line,

L'âne, l'ânesse vue, en rêve les beaux yeux,  
Le porc a pour la truie un regard amoureux,

may be given as a typical example of the way in which he paraphrases rather than translates his original.

The translations of Virgil into English are past numbering, but we should not place Dr. Way's among the most successful. The present volumes contain the text and translation of Books VII.-XII. Dr. Way employs long rhyming couplets of irregular lengths. The chief objection to this style of versification is that it does not run sufficiently smoothly and so fails to reproduce the ordered progress and stateliness of the Virgilian hexameter. The lines correspond exactly with those of the original, and this sometimes leads to such expansions as that of *talia iactantem dictis et dira canentem* (*Aen.* IX. 621) into "While he chanted, the foul-mouthed braggart, the thoughts of a scurril mind."

Mr. May has chosen blank verse for his translation of the *Aeneid*, which is a revised edition of a rendering published

by Mr. Nutt in 1902. Good blank verse is notoriously hard to write, but Mr. May's version is not without movement and life, while it certainly justifies its claim to literalness. Omitting nothing that is in the original, and being entirely free from 'padding,' it stands the severe test of the original on the opposite pages. The publishers are to be congratulated on the typography and binding of this handsome volume.

Mr. Perry's version of Terence is obviously the work of one who knows and loves his author. He aims at rendering the plays into the style and language of the Elizabethan dramatists, between whom and Terence there is, as the Introduction points out, a triple analogy, in that both wrote romantic comedy; both borrowed their plots, Terence from the new Greek comedy and the Elizabethans from Italian plays and novels; and both in point of language preceded the Classical Age in their respective countries by about a hundred years. Mr. Perry's experiment is singularly successful. One might point out small inconsistencies—for example, if *nervus* in the sense of 'prison' is to be translated by 'the bilboes,' ought not *minae* to be translated into Elizabethan currency? and is 'dungeon' as a term of abuse the Elizabethan equivalent of *carcer* in the sense of a 'jail-bird'?—but the general effect of the translation is excellent, and it can be thoroughly recommended both as a scholarly rendering and as a readable translation for those who do not know Latin.

E. S. FORSTER.

University of Sheffield.

#### A LATIN-DUTCH DICTIONARY.

*Beknopt Latijnsch-Nederlandsch Woordenboek.* Door F. MULLER, JUN., en E. H. RENKEMA. Pp. xii + 1038. Groningen & Den Haag: J. B. Wolters, 1929. 5.90 Dutch florins.

THIS book recalls both outwardly and inwardly the *Elementary Latin Dictionary* by Charlton T. Lewis (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1915), and it must not be supposed to be devoid of importance to the English-speaking public because

the equivalents for the Latin words are in Dutch. For it takes account of Minucius Felix, Lactantius *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, and Augustine's *Confessiones*, which are usually severely excluded from a work of this size. It is also well bound and printed on good paper. The printing itself is excellent, and the different senses of words are much more clearly separated than is usual, thick type being employed for the

words, the important meanings, and the numbers separating the meanings, while the quotations are in Roman type and the meanings of less important words are given in italics. An asterisk precedes each word or citation that is poetical, and an obelus each that belongs only to late prose. The authors themselves are named only where there is a special reason for doing so. Proper names are included, with great fulness, and the Greek is given where words are borrowed from that language.

I have tested the work throughout for all the types of information it gives, and have found it almost always accurate and highly to be recommended. The following points, however, deserve notice. *Alisequds*, which Professor Housman recently (*C.R.* XLIII. 168) restored to Catullus 66, 54, will have to be included in a new edition: under *Bedriacum* the alternative forms are neglected:

*cloaca*, add the alternative spelling *cluaca*: *imaginarie* occurs Aug. *Conf.* III. 2: *malevolus*, add the spelling *mali-volus*: Marcus, etc., the *a* should be marked long: *obicio*, the first *o* wrongly marked short: *prostibulum* has been put by mistake for *prostibulum*: *siparum* should no longer be equated with *sup-parum* after Housman's convincing demonstration (*C.Q.* XIII. 149 ff.): *spiritalis* should be rejected as mediaeval (*Raccolta di Scritti in onore di Felice Ramorino*, p. 286): *suppus* (Lucr. I. 1061) should be added: *Tarraciniensis*, though recalled by the corrigenda in favour of *Tarracinensis*, is certainly a correct form (*cf.* Petron. 48, and *pisciniensis*, etc.): *tribunicus*, quantity of second *i* wrongly marked long, as in Lewis and Short, but Lucan disproves this theory: *vici* should be *vices*, for the latter is the only nominative form cited (*C.R.* XVII. 55 f.).

A. SOUTER.

*De Hymnorum Homericorum memoria.* By P. S. BREUNING. Pp. 130; three photographs of MSS. Utrecht: A. Oosthoek, 1929. Paper.

THIS doctoral thesis, written in admirably clear Latin, does good service to the study of the *Hymns*. Breuning is modest, careful, and steeped in his subject. In Part I. he handles relationships between the MSS., many of which he has himself collated or inspected. The chief gain lies in his detaching from family *x* both *S*, as a copy of *ed. princeps* (so Hollander), and *z* (whence *H/K*) *D* and *At* as descendants of *f*, which comes independently of *x* and *β* from *ψ* (P. Maas's name for the ancestor of all the MSS. except *M*). *D* and *At* outshine *x* in representing the archetype. Further, *z* did not come from *D* or *At*, since in neither does III. 185 or 186 end a quaternion or page. These views seem well grounded; and for *D* and *At* they confirm Wilamowitz's sound conclusions on Callimachus. Again, Breuning establishes clearly from 'Homer' that *E* is *T*'s brother—not its son, as I held (*Cl. Quarterly*, April, 1920). This greatly helps in the much patched Callimachean portion of *E*, where I must now count the borrowings from *T* as accretions and the quaint resemblance at II. 54 as accidental. But he fails, I think, against two other views of mine: (1) That II has been contaminated with a member of the *f* stock; (2) that *x* and *β* had a common ancestor, collateral with *f*'s source. For (1) the *f* MS. may have dropped *δ* from *Hom. H.* IV. 79; and surely II cannot owe its fullness at Call. V. 128 to its scribe's *maior cognitio uel coniectura* (p. 18, n. 4). (2) Breuning's evidence (pp. 50-1) for counting *x*, *β*, and *f* as brothers supports my view, I believe, if one takes *x*'s constituents in

detail and admits my claim of II's contamination. Lack of space forbids fuller discussion of these differences. It forbids, too, more than a general mention of good points that will be found elsewhere in Part I. The ample citation of readings may seem somewhat out of focus; but it helps with a text where previous reports often disagree.

Part II. treats of variants in more than a hundred passages, largely by way of ascribing one or the other reading to a rhapsode. These discussions show a wealth of apposite learning; and some happy suggestions are made, notably at IV. 45. Two *excursus*, aided by photographs, discuss respectively the hands of some additions to *D* and of its main text.

M. T. SMILEY.

University College, London.

*Bijdrage tot de Kennis der Grieksche Toponymie.*

Door Dr. J. C. B. EIJKMAN. Pp. 96.

Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1929. Paper.

By 'place-name (stedenaam)' the author of this work means the name of an inhabited town or village, harbour or landing-place, and excludes names of natural features such as mountains or rivers, except when he mentions them incidentally. He excludes place-names which he believes to be of pre-Greek (Carian, etc.) origin, but, as the line between Greek and pre-Greek names is difficult to draw, some doubtful names are included with the query 'Grieksch?' The names are classified according to their grammatical character and further subdivided according to the meaning of the words from which they are formed. Of each name regarded as an individual only a very brief account is given, e.g. *Ταχυόσσα* or *Ταχυόσσα*, town near Miletus,



from *residues*, surrounded by walls,' under the head of 'uncompounded names which are adjectives indicating material properties; 'Κοηρία, place in Arcadia' under the head of 'names which cannot be exactly explained.' References to texts in which a name occurs are given in some cases, generally when they cannot be found in Pape-Benseler. Although provided with an alphabetical index of all the names occurring in it, the book is likely to be of little use to those who are in search of detailed information about a difficult name.

R. MCKENZIE.

St. John's College, Oxford.

*A Catalogue of the Ancient Marbles at Ince Blundell Hall.* By BERNARD ASHMOLE. Pp. xvi+139; 51 plates. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. £4 4s. net.

*The Thorvaldsen Museum.* Catalogue of the Antique Engraved Gems and Cameos. By POUL FOSSING. Pp. 301; 24 plates. Issued by the Thorvaldsen Museum. (English publisher: Humphrey Milford.) 27s. 6d. net.

THE Clarendon Press 'Michaelis de luxe' (C.R. XXXVIII. 140, XLIII. 202) advances by stately instalments but with a certain overlapping, since between twenty and thirty of the heads at Ince Blundell were included in Poulsen's *Greek and Roman Portraits*.

The collection at Ince Blundell was made by Henry Blundell between the years 1777 and 1810. It belongs, therefore, to the second great age of English collections, but Lords Lansdowne, Leicester, and Egremont, not to mention others, were in the field before Henry Blundell, who perhaps began a little late to secure pieces of the very first water. He seems also to have been a somewhat indiscriminate collector, and bought too many trifles. He was, however, a man of real taste, and his mistakes are for the most part antique mistakes, not forgeries. There is no 'Blundellstil' to match the 'Lowtherstil' called into being by the appetites of a later virtuoso (see Arndt-Amelung, ix., col. 23).

The collection consists of some four hundred items, and is therefore among the largest in the country. It includes a few Greek pieces, among them an archaic relief, three or four important large statues, and a great number of excellent heads, portrait and other. It was high time the collection was adequately catalogued, and this is a model of what such a catalogue should be. It is extremely succinct (not more than two or three entries run to a page; most are of two or three lines), very fully illustrated, and, as the photographs are by Professor Ashmole himself, they are of the finest quality. On one or two of the plates the photographs are a trifle crowded, but that is the only complaint that can be made.

Twenty years after Blundell bought his first piece of sculpture, the sculptor Thorvaldsen came to Rome, where he resided for most of the next forty years. Gems were not the only kind of antique he collected, but they were by far the most numerous, and at his death over two thousand passed, with his other antiques, to the Thorvaldsen Museum in Copenhagen.

His collection is not the most exciting kind of

gem collection; it contains very few Greek and not very many good Etruscan stones, and the vast majority are Graeco-Roman. But with that reservation the quality is high. The collection was not unknown, for a catalogue appeared in 1847, and some of the gems were included by Furtwaengler in his *Antike Gemmen*, but a full-dress illustrated catalogue such as this was well worth making and will be extremely useful. Nearly every stone is reproduced; the classification, so far as I can judge, is accurate, the text businesslike, and the English in which it is written practically faultless.

The printing, plates, and general get-up of these two handsome catalogues reflect the greatest credit upon the firms responsible in Oxford and Copenhagen; and between the two there is little to choose.

A. S. F. GOW.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

*Euripides Alkestis.* Erklärt von L. WEBER. Pp. iv+168. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner. 1930. M. 10.

LIKE Julius Caesar, Euripides has been judged 'suitable for beginners' and largely handed over to them, never perhaps more so than in the *Alkestis*. Hence there has been a dearth of competent and serious editions. Dr. Weber mentions only Hayley (1898) between Hermann in 1824 and the recent critical editions by Wecklein and by the Oxford Press. Weber's edition is scientific and abreast of the latest knowledge. His treatment of the text is cautious but eminently intelligent; his Introduction, dealing with the myth, competent, though to me not entirely convincing; his literary and dramatic criticism steadily good. The new fashion, started perhaps by the clever *Sophocles* of Tycho von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, of denying real character-study and consistency to Greek tragedies, has been applied particularly to the *Alkestis* by Lesky and Drexler in *Gnomon* (III. 442 ff.); but it has not seduced Dr. Weber. He deals to my mind successfully with all the supposed 'contradictions,' and sees, for instance, that the bitter scene between Admetus and Pheres has its dramatic justification in the effect which it produces in revealing Admetus to himself.

Among interesting readings adopted we may mention 152 τί χρή γενέσθαι τήνδ' ἐπερβεβλημένον; 321 οὐδ' ἐς τρίτην μοι μῦθος accepted as correct; 393 ff., 406 ff. forced into strophic correspondence; 708 λέγ' ὡς ἐμοῦ λέγοντος (not convincing to me); 1119 ἔχω; val; 795 f. and 817-820 deleted; 1126 οὐκ ἐστίν ἄλλη τήνδ' ὁρᾶς δάμαρρα σὴν.

G. MURRAY.

Christ Church, Oxford.

*Frammenti della Commedia Greca e del Mimo nella Sicilia e nella Magna Grecia.* Testo e Commento di ALESSANDRO OLIVIERI. Pp. iv+261; 14 figures in text. Napoli: Luigi Loffredo, 1930. Paper, L. 40.

THIS is an edition of the remains of Western Greek comedy and mime, with a commentary and introductions to each section in Italian. Such a work, which is necessarily a mass of details, could only be criticised satisfactorily in a very long review; but limitations of space

confine the present remarks to a few general impressions. Let it be said first of all that the work is entirely scholarly and well executed; the text of the fragments on the whole conservative; the commentary full, and the discussion of difficulties well balanced and well documented. The editor is thoroughly familiar with earlier editions and other writings on his subject. Comparison with Kaibel's edition of 1899 is inevitable, and it is characteristic of the present work that Epicharmus occupies 133 pages (larger than Kaibel's) against Kaibel's 57, the commentary being much more discursive and the introductory note to each play admitting much more conjecture as to the plot. Indeed, the principal weakness of this edition lies in the large amount of conjecture which is based on very slight evidence (*e.g.*, in the notes on fragments 7, 45, 60, and many others, and in the attempts to reconstruct a number of the plays of Epicharmus and some of the mimes of Sophron); but the conjectures often show a pleasant imagination, and being always accompanied by the evidence (where any exists) they do no harm and add some interest to the book. Kaibel's edition has an advantage in the fact that authorities are always quoted in the original, whereas (especially in such introductory chapters as that which gives an account of the *φλύακες*, pp. 121 ff.) Olivieri is content to summarise or translate. For scholars who are sufficiently advanced to study the fragments at all, the original Greek would be much more satisfactory, however accurate the summary or translation. It is perhaps a pity that the fragments are re-numbered, Kaibel's numbering being now in common use; but Kaibel's numbers are, of course, given as well. The section on the comedy of the *φλύακες* is particularly full and good, and most of the relevant vase-paintings are discussed, but the fourteen figures given are mostly poor and indistinct. There are a few improbabilities, *e.g.* the suggestion that the play of Rhinthon quoted by Herodian as *Εἰνοβάται* should be called *Ὀνοβάται*, and the attribution of fr. 12a (p. 133) to Rhinthon—a suggestion first made by Maas. But little if anything is omitted which ought to be found in a volume bearing the title given to this work, and the book may be welcomed as contributing to the diffusion of careful and healthy scholarship.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

*University of Edinburgh.*

*Hellenistic Civilisation.* By W. W. TARN. Second edition. Pp. viii + 334. London: Edward Arnold and Co., 1930. 16s. net.

MR. TARN has made a few corrections and additions in detail to his first edition, and has added references. These last are to ancient sources and (in the main) to modern literature subsequent to the first edition: a great advantage when the evidence is so scattered and hard to find. The author has thereby made a valuable book of still greater value, and all students of the many subjects with which he deals will be grateful to him. But there is still no map.

A. W. GOMME.

*University of Glasgow.*

*The Influence of Christ in the Ancient World.*

By T. R. GLOVER. Pp. 122. Cambridge University Press, 1929. Cloth, 5s. net.

THIS very little book upon a very large subject has the easy dexterity, the wide range of allusion, and the unflagging vivacity which his admirers have come to expect of Dr. Glover. It will be popular. But it tries to cover too much ground, and vivacity has perils of its own. There is even a danger that the reader may be distracted from the matter in hand and perhaps lay down the book with more enlightenment upon Dr. Glover's tastes and prejudices, modern as well as ancient, than upon the subject of his essay. With Dr. Glover all of us would agree that Christianity emerged triumphant as a result of its difference in quality from rival religions, and most of us would also agree that the essence of this peculiar quality lies in the personality of the historical Jesus. But further than this we do not here get much enlightenment, and the method of the essay smacks so strongly of special pleading that it may rather darken counsel. It exploits as its text that phrase thrown out casually by Bury—'failure of nerve'—which has already been made to bear a burden heavier than its original inventor can have intended, and it studiously belittles by means of generalisations which are often specious rather than sound the contemporary pagan culture. Fundamentally this method of attacking the problem is sterile, and incidentally it is a poor tribute to the victory of Christianity.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

*King's College,  
London.*

*Titles of Address in Christian Greek Epistolography to A.D. 527.* By Sister Lucilla Dinneen. Pp. xiii + 115. (The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. XVIII.) Washington: Catholic University of America, 1929. Paper, \$3.

LETTERS of the early Byzantine period bristle with titles and epithets of courtesy and also, of course, with official titles. Sister Lucilla has collected and classified such titles in Christian letters down to the accession of Justinian, and has also examined, for purposes of comparison, the Letters of Julian and of Libanius. Her book contains a good collection of material, and her classification is useful so far as it goes. It distinguishes ecclesiastical from secular titles, and adds a list of miscellaneous uses, titles addressed or applied to women, to the deceased, etc. It fails, however, to distinguish courtesy titles from official titles of rank; Sister Lucilla appears to be unacquainted with Koch's *Byz. Beamtentitel*, and is therefore, to take a single instance, unconscious of the chasm which separates the two occurrences of *γενναϊότατος* quoted on p. 97. In general, her treatment of the subject suffers from a lack of contact with the historical facts which make a study of titulature instructive; thus on p. 84 there is a list of 'titles continued from classical usage' including items like *ἄνθρωπε*, *δαμόνιε*, etc., but when on p. 32 examples of *εὐσεβής* applied to Byzantine Emperors are quoted we are not informed that this was the regular translation

of *pius* in the Imperial period. Again, among the titles applied to bishops we find *διδάσκαλος* and *διδάκτορας*, both well illustrated, followed by *πάππας*, without any hint of the interesting problems raised by the use of this word in the literature and inscriptions of East and of West, or any adequate reference to the literature on the subject. The book is disfigured by many misprints. Its usefulness to the future historian of Imperial and early Byzantine titulature is enhanced by liberal quotation of passages containing titles and by indices.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Manchester.

*Private Letters Pagan and Christian.* An Anthology of Greek and Roman Private Letters from the Fifth Century before Christ to the Fifth Century of our Era. By DOROTHY BROOKE. Pp. xxx+177. London: Ernest Benn, 1929. 15s.

THIS Anthology of Letters proves so engrossing that it is surprising that no one ever thought of one before. The book comprises some two hundred letters arranged more or less chronologically in eleven sections. One section is devoted to early Greek letters dating roughly from Themistocles to Alexander the Great, two to imaginary letters, four to papyrus letters of different periods, three to Roman letters, one to letters from the Saints. A short essay, distinguished by both charm and restraint, introduces the collection, which is admittedly intended for neither the scholar nor the literary critic, but for the general reader who has a gossiping curiosity about his fellow men. Hence 'a preference for the private and personal rather than the public and monumental' has guided the selection. The hackneyed and the self-conscious, the political and the controversial, have been severely excluded. We are admitted to the company of the Great, but generally when they are off their guard—Marcus Aurelius finding a scorpion in his bed as the climax to a chapter of accidents; Synesius ordering his summer suits or criticising the bad taste of his relatives; St. Augustine perplexed by his conjugations and quantities. In such circumstances the Great are apt to become very human.

Lady Brooke has shown both discrimination and taste in her selection. The letters are of varied interest and wide appeal, and many of them quite astonishingly modern in tone. About a third of the book is devoted to the letters from the Saints. This section includes some of the most interesting and memorable examples. St. Jerome's rebuke to St. Augustine is a masterly piece of courteous snubbing. Passion still vibrates in Sidonius' denunciation of an infamous peace, and the heart-searchings and scruples of Synesius before accepting his bishopric stir both admiration and pity for a sturdy soul in conflict.

The form and the arrangement of the collection are admirable. Footnotes, so distracting and irritating in a book of this kind, are almost eliminated. A brief but well-chosen title gives the clue to each letter, and a short Biographical Index at the end furnishes the necessary facts and dates, and sometimes the source where the

letters may be found. A complete Reference List, however, would be a useful addition. In several cases the numerical references to the text require revision (e.g., the letters attributed to Alciphron, Gregory, Jerome and Theodoret). The translations are drawn from standard works, or, where they are anonymous, are presumably the work of the compiler herself. The style is good and has dignity and natural grace. The book can be safely recommended as one likely to stimulate further investigation. In brief, the task of compilation has been not only well worth doing, but well done.

J. HUSBAND.

University of Manchester.

*Beiträge zur Lehre vom indogermanischen Charakter der etruskischen Sprache.* Von EMIL GOLDMANN. I. Teil, pp. x+150; II. Teil, pp. xiv+397. Heidelberg: Winter, 1929, 1930. M. 8 and 21.

IT is unfortunate that the very narrow base on which Dr. Goldmann's learned speculations are balanced is almost entirely invisible to the reader of this book. The demonstration that Etr. \**am* means 'day' and Etr. \**nac* 'night', which appeared in an earlier publication of Dr. Goldmann's, forms the starting-point of a number of studies designed to prove that the Etruscan language is strongly Indo-Germanic in character in respect both of vocabulary and morphology. Unfortunately, Dr. Goldmann's method is not likely to lead to certain, or even probable, conclusions. The author makes no secret of the fact that he employs the etymological method, and justifies it on the ground that, the Indo-Germanic character of \**am* and \**nac* having been established, the evidence of Indo-Germanic languages for the meaning of other Etruscan words can now be heard. The argument is fallacious. Even if it had been proved beyond the possibility of dispute that \**am* and \**nac* mean 'day' and 'night', we would not be appreciably advanced on the road to the demonstration that Etruscan is an Indo-Germanic language in any sense of the word. The comparison of \**am* with Greek *ἡμαρ* can have no significance for Dr. Goldmann's theory, for the etymology of the Greek word is unknown; and \**nac* could very well mean 'night' and yet have no connection whatever with the Latin *nox*. The plain fact of the matter is that, until Etruscan can be read and understood in the same sense by all Etruscologists, a combinatorische Beweisführung, such as Dr. Goldmann professes to employ, runs the risk of being merely an exercise in thinly disguised etymological speculation.

J. FRASER.

*Vergil's Vierte Ekloge und das Sidus Iulium.* Von H. WAGENVOORT. Pp. 37. (Mededelingen der Kon. Akad. van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Deel 67, Serie A, No. 1.) Amsterdam. 1929.

MR. WAGENVOORT here puts forward an entirely new view as to the interpretation of Vergil's Messianic Eclogue. The 'puer' who is to bring peace and regeneration to the world is none

other than Octavian himself, destined to be reborn during Pollio's consulship! Before the main thesis is broached a few suggestions regarding particular lines or passages in the poem are offered. For instance, the 'ultima Cumaei carminis aetas' of v. 4 is the transitional period between the last age of the tenfold cycle and the new golden age of Saturn. It is over this transitional period (an 'aetas,' not a 'saeculum') which has already come, that Apollo presides; 'tuus iam regnat Apollo,' v. 10. In vv. 21-24 the influence of Isaiah is admitted. While v. 24 refers to the extinction of harmful beasts, v. 22 merely indicates a state of peace in the animal world and force is thus given to 'magnum,' 'however great they be.'

Now for the main contention of the book. Vergil implies that a Sibylline oracle prophesied the commencement of a golden age in 40 B.C. The author thinks it likely that this oracle mentioned a sign that would herald this new epoch, and this sign he conjectures to have been the comet that appeared in July 44, usually called the sidus Iulium and generally interpreted as an indication of the apotheosis of Julius Caesar. Now though Octavian in public paid lip-service to this interpretation we are told that in secret he connected the comet with his own fortunes. 'Interiore gaudio sibi illum natum seque in eo nasci interpretatus est' (Pliny *N.H.* II. 94). That is, to Octavian himself the appearance of the comet was a sign of his own re-birth, which meant the incarnation of some divinity in him. Thus Octavian is the 'magnum Iovis incrementum.' (The senate had dedicated a temple and flamen to Julius Caesar under the title of Jupiter Julius in January, 44.)

The theory thus depends on the pure assumption that there was an oracle extant at the time which stated that three and a half years after the appearance of a comet (July, 44—January, 40—three and a half years) a new age of happiness would begin. Though instances are adduced of the part played by the number 3½ in connexion with prophecies in the books of Daniel and the *Apocalypse*, in Josephus and the extant Sibylline oracles themselves, the existence of this oracle must remain a conjecture. In spite of the efforts to show that it was natural for Vergil to have known Octavian's private view of the significance of the comet, and to explain away the total absence from the poem of any hint of a comet, many will find it difficult to agree with the conclusions here set forth. The author believes the poem might have been written in 43 before Pollio went over to Antony and after the triumvirs had named the consuls for five years to come. Mr. Wagenvoort's ingenious theory makes entertaining reading and is backed by some clever arguments, but takes far too much for granted at the outset.

E. J. WOOD.

University of Manchester.

*A Chronology of Vulgar Latin.* By H. F. MULLER. (*Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, Beiheft 78). Pp. ix+172. Halle: Niemeyer, 1929. Paper, M. 12.50.

MUCH thought and learning have gone to the making of this book, and although we do not

believe that the author has proved his main contention, namely that speech unity prevailed over the Latin-speaking countries until the ninth century, yet the book is none the less very instructive and stimulating.

In attempting to refute the accepted dogma that dialectalisation began with the break-up of the Roman centralised system under the stress of invasion Mr. Muller dwells upon the community of interests and activities which prevailed in Western Europe under the Merovingians, the mingling of population from various regions through trading, pilgrimages, migration of craftsmen and the like, the internationalism of church and monastery. This common civilisation had a common medium of expression, as witnessed by the fact that the Merovingian documents, from whatever region, display the same linguistic innovations—the new Romance future and the analytic passive, for example, in the same proportions. The various regions, therefore, shared in a common linguistic life. The disruption came later, after the reign of Charlemagne's son Louis, with the rise of feudalism, which by crystalising the population into a number of isolated communities 'turned Romance into a multitude of village speeches, the material out of which the medieval dialects were to be formed.'

One cannot help feeling that Mr. Muller has stressed unduly both the cohesion of the Merovingian period and the disruption of the Carolingian. The fact that money was coined in as many as 884 places under the Merovingians is scarcely a proof of unity. As for the later period, the lords mixed and travelled and their retainers too. The church had not ceased to function, there were still pilgrims, and there can scarcely have been less religious homogeneity in the ninth century when paganism had been extirpated, than in the sixth and seventh when it was being vigorously combated. Mr. Muller's thesis leaves unexplained the fact that, despite Charlemagne's reconstruction of imperial unity, the first recommendation to the clergy to use the vernacular 'rustica romana lingua' was made by the Council of Tours in 813, and the first piece of French we have goes back to 842.

We are equally unconvinced by the author's main linguistic argument, that the existence of this common literary and administrative medium, to which he gives, somewhat unduly, the name of Vulgar Latin, proves an absence of dialectalisation in the underlying domain of spoken language. We have always considered that the so-called unity of spoken Latin throughout the Roman Empire was a myth, entirely out of keeping with the facts of language as we can observe them today. It is true, no doubt, that Mohl failed in his endeavour to account for various divergences in the Romance languages by what is discoverable of this or that Italic dialect. It is also true that the inscriptions from various parts of the empire reveal a remarkable absence of dialect features. But how much of the vigorous dialect of Lancashire would be revealed by a study of the tombstone epigraphy of the eighteenth or nineteenth century? When Mr. Muller can show us a case of complete speech unity existing in any country, province,



town, or even family, today, then perhaps we may be prepared to consider the probability that over the vast Roman empire, with a population of Iberians, Celts, Ligurians and what-not, Latin, spoken with varying degrees of purity by soldiers, traders, officials, lawyers and schoolmasters, and laboriously acquired by the conquered peoples, attained uniformity and maintained it for a period of several centuries.

The chief value of Mr. Muller's book lies elsewhere, for example in his interesting account of the development of specifically Romance constructions; but these scarcely come within the scope of this journal.

JOHN ORR.

University of Manchester.

*Der Begriff der Seele in der Ethik des Plotin.* Von PAUL OSKAR KRISTELLER. (Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur Philosophie u. ihrer Geschichte, 19.) Pp. vi+108. Tübingen: Mohr, 1929. Paper, M. 6.

LIKE another essay recently noticed in this *Review* (Nebel's book on the Plotinian categories), this dissertation owes its origin to Professor Hoffmann's seminar at Heidelberg, where Plotinus is evidently thought worthy of the same exact and detailed study which has so long been devoted to Plato and Aristotle. But Dr. Kristeller has his own angle of approach to the *Enneads*. He is not primarily interested either in 'philological' problems—his one excursion into textual interpretation (p. 17, n. 1) cannot be called happy—or in tracing historical affiliations: his aim is to get behind the traditional Platonic or Stoic terminology and expose the underlying presuppositions, presuppositions rather of personal experience than of conceptual thought, which govern Plotinus' philosophy and cause him to use the traditional language in a new way. This ambitious undertaking he attempts to carry through only in the domain of ethics; but in his view the ethical doctrine of the *Enneads*, which has hitherto been relatively neglected, is more fundamental than the ontology and indeed contains the key to the whole system. This key is found in the antithesis between empirical consciousness and what he calls 'metaphysical' consciousness, or between the life of the soul as a part of the *κόσμος* and its life *καθ' αὐτὴν*. After examining the relationship of these two grades of inner experience he goes on to show that this antithesis is the determining factor in the development of Plotinus' ethical teaching on its various sides. His method involves a good deal of rather fatiguing repetition, which sometimes appears, when divested of its elaborate terminological clothing, as repetition of the obvious. A more serious danger which he does not, I think, wholly escape is that of starting from what Plotinus *ought* (logically) to have thought and proceeding to read it into the *Enneads* by an arbitrary selection of *Belegstellen* isolated from their context. I suspect that Plotinus was a less tidy and systematic thinker than Dr. Kristeller. Nevertheless the book will repay careful study. Particularly valuable are the chapter on the doctrine of freedom and the light thrown on the implications of a whole

series of Plotinian concepts, such as *πάθος*, *ἀναγκαῖον*, *περίστασις*, *σπουδαῖος*, *αἰσχροκτεια*, *πᾶσις*. If one is left at the end with a sense of incompleteness, this is due to the limitation of the theme to the ethical field. We have been told much about the relation of the 'metaphysical consciousness' to the lower self and to the world of sense, but nothing about its proper content. The question as to the meaning of *νοῦς* and *νόησις*, which Bréhier's work shows to be the fundamental question about Plotinus, remains unanswered. It is to be hoped that Dr. Kristeller will complete his interpretation by answering it for us in another volume.

E. R. DODDS.

University of Birmingham.

*A Concordance to the Historia Ecclesiastica of Bede.* By PUTNAM FENNELL JONES. Pp. x+585. Cambridge (Mass.): Mediaeval Academy of America, 1929. \$6.50.

ENGLAND has in Bede's history a document 'of far greater worth, both as regards form and matter, than the *origines* of Germany or of any other European nation' (J. E. B. Mayor). It is very fitting, therefore, that a concordance to this work should at last be published, especially as it is based on the standard text of Dr. Plummer, whose pages and lines are quoted in addition to the books and chapters. The author has enjoyed the advice of Professor Lane Cooper, the experienced maker of concordances, and the book should appeal powerfully to various classes of students. Those who are interested in the development of Latin will discover that Bede stands high among the purists of post-classical times. An excellent feature is that proper names are explained or have their modern equivalents added. The only slight criticisms that one might pass on the execution of the work are these: documents quoted by Bede should be distinguished from Bede's own work; cross-references to alternative forms (e.g., *unanims* and *unianims*) should have been given; there was probably no word *idolatr* (p. 248), the form *idolatr* being derived from *idolatra*; there are misprints on pp. 116 and 301.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

*Regula S. Benedicti: Specimina selecta e codice antiquissimo Oxoniensi elegit atque adnotatione instruxit E. A. LOWE, Palaeographiae apud Oxonienses Praelector.* Pp. 15; 5 full-page plates. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1929. 7s. 6d. net.

THE decision of the Bodleian authorities to issue the above work on the fourteen-hundredth anniversary of the foundation of the Benedictine Abbey of Monte Cassino will be generally acknowledged as appropriate. It happens that the Bodleian possesses, in MS. Hatton 48, the oldest extant manuscript of the *Rule* of St. Benedict, which is also the only uncial MS. of the *Rule*, while it is further 'the oldest Oxford manuscript of English provenance, and ranks among the earliest productions of English scriptoria' (Dr. Craster's preface). Dr. Lowe has written an admirable palaeographical introduction to the carefully selected facsimiles, and

dates the MS. about A.D. 700, assigning it with some hesitation to Canterbury. These conclusions are not likely to be refuted, and it is satisfactory that they practically confirm the views of other recent scholars. Not the least important part of Lowe's preface is his list of English uncial MSS. and charters, which contains twenty items, of which thirteen are happily still in England. He has little occasion in a palaeographical work to refer to printed editions in which use has been made of the Hatton MS.; the reader will find this information most readily in the second edition of the *Rule* by Dom Butler, formerly Abbot of Downside, published at Freiburg im Breisgau early in 1928 (dated 1927). The present work is of altogether exceptional beauty.

A. SOUTER.

*University of Aberdeen.*

*St. Andrews University Publications, XXVIII. Palaeographia Latina. Part VI.* Edited by Professor W. M. LINDSAY. Pp. 68; 10 plates. London: Humphrey Milford, 1929. 5s. net.

THIS part of Professor Lindsay's invaluable publication ought to be as welcome as any of its predecessors. The greater part of it consists of a thorough study of the St. Gall writing school in the second half of the eighth century by the well-known palaeographer Karl Löffler. This is an important addition to the studies of other writing schools, such as Verona, Bobbio, Mainz, Lorsch, Fulda, etc., already carried out mainly by Professor Lindsay himself. Some forty-two manuscripts still in the St. Gall *Stiftsbibliothek* are passed under review, and ten admirable plates illustrate the script. I am glad to find Löffler in agreement with the view I reached twenty years ago that MS. 126 (St. Jerome on St. Matthew) is of the eighth century (saec. VIII.-IX. Scherrer, saec. IX. Lindsay). Perhaps someone will extend the investigation to A.D. 850, and undertake a corresponding study of the Reichenau MSS. In particular a study of the interrelations between the St. Gall and Reichenau 'duplicate' MSS. would be fascinating. The last two pages are devoted to a further article on the abbreviation 'haeret' by Dom de Bruyne. I confess myself still sceptical about this abbreviation, but further investigation will perhaps shed more light on its possibility.

A. SOUTER.

*University of Aberdeen.*

*Handboek der Latijnsche Letterkunde.* Door Dr. P. J. ENK. I. De Latijnsche Letterkunde voor den Invloed van het Hellenisme. Pp. 320. Zutphen: W. J. Thieme en Cie, 1928.

ALTHOUGH not so long as many books of the same number of pages, being printed in rather large type, this volume, by the fullness with which it treats a small portion of the history of Roman literature, suggests that the planned work of which it is the first volume will be of considerable size. The volume ends at the point at which many histories begin, just before the period of Livius Andronicus, who is here made to cede to Appius Claudius Caecus, the censor

of 312 B.C., the honour of being the first Latin writer. Even Appius Claudius, however, is not reached before p. 282, and the greater part of the volume is devoted to topics which are rather preparatory to a history of literature than part of it. These topics are treated by Dr. Enk in a clear and interesting way, and his book ought to be useful to many whose interest is not so much in Roman literature as in Roman history in the wider sense, Roman religion, Roman law, or the languages of Italy. After a general introduction which consists of a sketch of the peoples of Italy, including the Etruscans, with some account not only of their character but of their languages, illustrated, in the case of Oscan and Umbrian, by specimens accompanied by a commentary, Dr. Enk passes in review what is known of the earliest kinds of Latin verse and prose, entering into considerable detail and giving numerous specimens, each accompanied by the necessary commentary. Bibliographical lists are appended to the treatment of each topic, but the aim of the author is that his book should be read through and not merely used for reference. A number of good photographs and drawings add appreciably to its interest.

R. MCKENZIE.

*St. John's College, Oxford.*

*Philological Studies in Ancient Glass.* By MARY LUELLA TROWBRIDGE. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. XIII., Nos. 3-4, August, November, 1928.) Pp. 206. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1930. Paper.

THE author has collected what must be virtually a complete list of the references to glass and glazing in Greek and Latin literature from Homer to Theophilus, and sets out to analyse critically the evidence they divulge as to the manufacture and use of glass in antiquity.

Glass was always rather a mystery to the ancients and their references to it are full of inconsistencies and inaccuracies. In their statements on this subject old wives' tales are mingled higgledy-piggledy with scientific facts, and the unravelling of the tangle proves to-day an impossible task.

In this book a brave attempt is made to clarify the evidence. Archaeological finds, if called upon, might have helped in certain cases, though not everywhere, but no account is taken of them, for the author decided at the outset that she must confine herself strictly to the literary evidence. A more logical arrangement with less repetition of quotations would have shortened the text considerably and thereby added to its value. The index, too, is sadly inadequate, and one misses an alphabetical list of the quotations from ancient sources. Misprints, especially in the Greek texts, are not rare.

Nevertheless the book is welcome as the first attempt to collect the mass of evidence, good, bad, and indifferent. It will remain a useful reference book, not only for philologists, but also for archaeologists.

D. B. HARDEN.

*Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.*

*Donum Natalicium Schrijnen.* Verzameling van opstellen door oudleerlingen en bevriende vakgenooten opgedragen aan Mgr. Prof. Dr. J. SCHRIJNEN beilegelegenheid van zijn zestigsten verjaardag, 3 Mei 1929. Pp. xxviii + 926. Nijmegen-Utrecht: N. V. Dekker en Van de Vegt, 1929.

OF this large and handsome volume of essays presented to Mgr. Schrijnen on his sixtieth birthday more than a third is written in German, more than a quarter in Dutch, more than a sixth in French, about a twelfth in English, and the remainder in Italian, Latin, Roumanian, and Bulgarian. It is divided into four sections according to subjects: Section I. (144 pp.) is devoted to general linguistic science, and includes essays on questions of general phonetics, syntax and word geography, among which E. Sapir's essay on Male and Female Forms of Speech in Yana is not the least interesting. Section II., on 'Non-Indo-European Linguistic Science,' opens with an article on Metaphorical Expressions in the Language of the Kwakiutl Indians by Franz Boas, which is followed by a number of other studies of the phonetics, syntax, or other features of languages spoken in various parts of the globe. From a classical point of view one of the most interesting is the essay (pp. 213-217) in which J. Melich proves that the Hungarian river-name Ompoly has never been pronounced with an *l* and is written without an *l* in mediaeval documents until the end of the eighteenth century (*Ompoy*, etc.); that *Ampele(n)sium* is therefore more probable than *Ampele(n)sium* as the reading of *C.I.L.* III. 1308, p. 218; furthermore, that the Roumanian name (*Ompoiu* and *Ampoi*, *Ampoi*) is borrowed from Hungarian,

and that the Hungarian name cannot be Slavonic or Bulgaro-Slavonic in origin. M. Cohen examines the definition and name of the Sirens, comparing together the ways in which the idea is rendered in various versions of the Old Testament. F. Hestermann writes on 'Matriarchalische Lykische Inschriften,' and Professor Sayce on 'The Linguistic Position of Hittite.' Section III., covering 507 pages, is concerned with the 'European Languages,' and falls into three subsections: Subsection A, 'The Palaeo-European Substratum,' includes an article by P. Kretschmer on the 'Tyrrhenian Inscription of Lemnos.' Subsection B, 'Indo-European Comparative Philology' (pp. 325-613), contains detailed studies of particular problems too numerous to be catalogued here. It must suffice to draw attention to the interesting article of composite authorship edited by J. Vercoullie, entitled 'Het "to bliktri"-raadsel,' in which it is made probable that the Greek word *τὸ βλέπτρι* has travelled through a large part of Europe and even reached England. Several of the essays are concerned with modern Romance or Germanic languages, and among the latter, as is natural, Dutch dialects are prominent. In Subsection C, 'Classical Languages and Literature' (pp. 617-782), Latin and Greek receive equal attention. Several of these essays are on points of literary history, textual criticism or interpretation, and one is on the mosaic in the apse of the church of St. Paulinus at Nola. Section IV. (pp. 785 ff.) is headed 'History of Religion, Ethnology and Folklore,' and is as wide in its range as the rest of the volume.

R. MCKENZIE.

St. John's College, Oxford.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

### CLASSICAL WEEKLY (NEW YORK).

(1930.)

GRAMMAR.—March 24. Winifred M. Carmody, *The Subjunctive in Tacitus* [University of Chicago Press, 1926] (H. C. Nutting). Long review, generally unfavourable.

LITERATURE.—May 5. N. Moseley, *Characters and Epithets: a Study in Vergil's Aeneid* [Yale University Press, 1926] (J. J. Savage). An elaborate dissertation on V's use of epithets as applied to persons, especially to Dido, Juno, Venus, Ascanius and Aeneas.

[The issue of March 24 contains a list of classical articles in non-classical periodicals.]

### MUSÉE BELGE. BULLETIN BIBLIOGRAPHIQUE ET PÉDAGOGIQUE. XXXIII. JULY-OCTOBER, 1929.

GREEK.—*Epictetus*: W. A. Oldfather, *Contributions towards a Bibliography of E. Appendix: Jacob Schenck's Translation of the Encheiridion*, 1534. Univ. Illinois, 1927. Favourable (J. Davreux). *Homer*: F. L. Clark, *A Study of the Iliad in Translation*, Chicago, 1927. Good introduction for young

students without Greek (J. Davreux). *Sophocles*: A. Willem, *Oedipe Roi*, éd. classique, Liège, 1928. Favourable (R. Scalais). *Theocritus*: E. della Valle, *Il canto bucolico in Sicilia e nella Magna Grecia*, Naples, 1927. Too imaginative (A. Severyns).

LATIN.—*Caesar*: L. A. Constans, *Guerre des Gaules*, Hachette, 1929. Attractive school edition (P. Faider). *Catullus*: C. Saggio, *C. testo e trad.*, Milan, 1928, 40 lire. An édition de luxe (Id.) *Cicero*: H. Bornecque et G. Rabaud, *Sec. Action contre Verrès, l. V. Les Supplices*, Coll. Budé, 1928. Favourable (A. Willem). *Ennius*: N. Terzaghi, *La technica tragica di E.* (in Studi Ital. Filol. Class., 1928). Favourable (P. Faider). *Fortunatus*: D. Tardi, *F. Étude sur un dernier représentant de la poésie latine dans la Gaule Mérovingienne*, Boivin, 1927. Summary by L. Rochus. *Horace*: A. Dupouy, *H.*, Grasset, Paris, 1928, pp. 266. Lively and interesting (E. Remy). *Palladius*: J. Svennung, *Om P. de medicina pecorum*, Gothenburg, 1929. Good reply to Widstrand (L. Rochus). *Pelagonius*: K. Hoppe, *Die commenta artis med. veterinariae des P.*, Leipzig, 1927. Favourable (L. Herrmann). *Pliny*: A. M.

- Guillemin, *P. et la vie littéraire de son temps*, Les Belles Lettres, 1929. Favourable (P. Faider). *Plautus*: Fr. Marx, *Rudens*, Hirzel, Leipzig, 1928. Masterly edition (J. P. W.), N. Terzaghi, *Intorno ai dopponi plautini* (in Atti R. Accad. Torino, 1928.) Favourable (P. Faider). *Seneca*: C. Cardo, *Dialogs a Serì: de la Clemencia*. Fundacio Metge, Barcelona, 1926. Good compilation (P. Faider). G. Carlsson, *Zu S. Tragödien. Lesungen und Deutungen*, Lund, 1928-9. L. Herrmann accepts some. G. Ammendola, *Della Clemenza*, Paravia, Turin, 1928. Favourable (L. Rochus). C. Favez, *ad Marciam de consolatione*, de Boccard, 1928. Very useful (L. Herrmann). *Virgil*: M. de Coppet, *Les Buc. de V. trad. en alexandrins*, Helsingfors, 1928. Unfavourable (Id.). N. Terzaghi, *Nevio e V.*, 1929, pp. 23. Vindicates V. from a suspicion of servility (P. Faider). H. Wagenvoort, *V's vierte Ekloge und das Sidus Iutium*, Amsterdam, 1929, pp. 37. Theory (the child is Octavius) rejected by L. Herrmann. *Vulgate*: H. J. Vogel, *Vulgastudien*, Münster, 1928. Favourable (J. P. W.).
- ARCHAEOLOGY.—E. Gjerstad, *Studies in Pre-historic Cyprus*, Upsala, 1926. D. M. Robinson, *A Preliminary Report on the Excavations at Olynthus*, Amer. J. Arch., 1929. Summaries by J. Herbillon.
- HISTORY.—M. A. Levi, *La Costituzione romana dai Gracchi a Giulio Cesare*, Vallecchi, Florence, 1928. E. Cavaignac, *La paix romaine*, de Boccard, 1928. V. Chapot, *Le monde romain* (Évolution de l'Humanité, 1927). Reviews by R. Scalais. J. B. Bury, *The Invasion of Europe by the Barbarians*, Macmillan, 1928. Favourable (J. de Ghellinck). R. Scalais, *L'évolution de la constitution rom.*, pp. 23 (A. Willem). J. W. Mackail, *The lesson of Imperial Rome* (lecture), Murray, 1928. Favourable (Id.).
- GENERAL.—E. H. Warmington, *Commerce between the Roman Empire and India*, Cambridge, 1928. Favourable (J. de Ghellinck). J. Kromayer and G. Veith, *Heerwesen und Kriegsführung der Griechen und Römer*, 1928. Summary by H. van de Weerd. H. Delehay, *Sanctus. Essai sur le Culte des Saints dans l'Antiquité*, Brussels, 1927. Learned and clear (J. Hubaux). L. Köhler, *Die Briefe des Sokrates und der Sokratiker*, Leipzig, 1928 (Philologus). Favourable (A. Severys). O. Kern, *Hermann Diels und Carl Robert. Ein biograph. Versuch*. Leipzig, 1927 (Id.). P. J. Koets, *Δεισιδαιμονία. A contribution to the knowledge of religious terminology in Greek*. Utrecht, 1929. Favourable (J. Herbillon). E. Bevan, *Stoiciens et Septiques, trad.*, Belles Lettres, 1927. Favourable (E. Remy). C. C. Thursby and G. D. Kyne, *Living Latin for the Junior High School*, Macmillan, New York. Highly praised by L. Rochus. P. Faider notices three papers by E. Malcovati, *Favorinus o Favonius? De Catonis orationibus censoriis: Il latino come lingua universale* (Pavia, 1927-9).
- PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.  
APRIL—JUNE, 1930.
- GREEK LITERATURE.—W. M. A. van de Wijnpersse, *De terminologie van het jachtwesen bij Sophocles* [Amsterdam, 1929. Pp. 95] (Kraemer). Interesting and instructive work, opening up a not much trodden field. Sophocles appears to use hunting terms less frequently than Aeschylus and Euripides.—W. Schadewaldt, *Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion* [Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, 1928. Pp. 84] (Kalinka). Though not free from objections S.'s treatise advances our knowledge of Pindar's methods.—C. F. Kumaniecki, *De Satyro Peripatetico* [Cracow, 1929] (Blatt). Reviewer gives summary of the main results of this penetrating research.—A. Severys, *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque* [Liège and Paris, 1928, Vaillant-Carmanne and Champion. Pp. 454] (Lorenz). Contains a wealth of material, especially from scholia on Homer, which good indices make easily accessible.—*Hippolytus' Werke*, 4 Bd.: *Die Chronik*. Hergestellt von A. Bauer, durchgesehen und herausg. von R. Helm. Die griech.-christl. Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrh., Bd. 36 [Leipzig, 1929, Hinrichs. Pp. viii + 562] (Mras). Equal praise is due to B. and to H. for their great achievement. In addition to text there are critical notes, parallel passages, and a very clear index.
- LATIN LITERATURE.—P. C. Tacitus *Germania*. Herausg., übersetzt und mit Bemerkungen versehen von E. Fehrlé [Munich, 1929, Lehmann. Pp. vii + 110, with 39 figures on 14 plates and 1 map] (Gudeman). Text open to some criticism, translation (opposite text) generally skilful and clear, commentary concentrates on cult usages and folklore. Serviceable and warmly recommended in spite of gaps.—*Apulei Metamorphoseon libri XI*. Ed. C. Giarratano [Turin, 1929. Pp. 1 + 333] (Helm). Valuable addition to the series of the Corpus Script. Lat. Paravianum. G.'s work is on a level with the best critical editions. The text, which reviewer considers too conservative, is discussed at length.—*Cicéron Discours. Tome VII*. Texte ét. et trad. par A. Boulanger [Paris, 1929, Soc. d'édition 'Les Belles Lettres.' Pp. 194] (Klotz). Good edition except for the critical apparatus, which is both insufficient and unreliable.—*Asinarius und Rapularius*. Herausg. von K. Langosch. Sammlung mittellat. Texte, Nr. 10 [Heidelberg, 1929, Winter. Pp. xii + 108] (Manitius). Very careful edition based on every available MS. Questions of language and metre thoroughly discussed. Highly praised.—*Q. Septimii Florentini Tertulliani Ad nationes libri duo*. Ed. J. G. Borleffs [Leiden, 1929. Brill. Pp. xix + 155] (Tolkiehn). In the main a critical edition in which one can take pleasure. Much fuller apparatus than is unfortunately customary nowadays.—E. Cesareo, *Il carme natalizio nella poesia latina* (Palermo, 1929. Pp. 229] (Helm). Rightly emphasizes the significance of the Genius for the Romans. But the book



is permeated by a one-sided idealism and would have been much improved by a good dose of scepticism.—A. M. Guillemin, *Pline et la vie littéraire de son temps* [Paris, 1929, Soc. d'édition 'Les Belles Lettres.' Pp. 155] (Ax). Though not fulfilling every requirement in exploring and interpreting details, G. is thoroughly familiar with literary life in Pliny's time and presents a picture full of spirit.—F. Novotný, *État actuel des études sur le rythme de la prose latine*. Eus suppl. vol. V. [Lwow, 1929. Pp. vii+95] (Klotz). A happy idea to sum up the present position in this field. N. has provided a first-rate aid to further research by showing what has so far been done and how much is of real value. Reviewer gives detailed summary of contents.

HISTORY.—J. Carcopino, *Autour des Gracques*.

*Études critiques* [Paris, 1928, Soc. d'édition 'Les Belles Lettres.' Pp. 307] (Stein). A notable addition to the literature concerning this important period of Roman history. Exceptionally penetrating study leading to surprising, at times even revolutionary, results.—T. R. S. Broughton, *The Romanization of Africa Proconsularis* [Baltimore, 1929, The Johns Hopkins Press. Pp. ix + 233] (Stein). Deals with history of Roman Africa down to Septimius Severus. Careful work, but the unnecessarily sharp division into

periods makes it rather a collection of separate investigations than a continuous account of the development of the province.

LEXICOGRAPHY.—F. Muller and E. H. Renkema, *Beknopt Latijnsch-Nederlandsch Woordenboek* [Groningen, 1928. Pp. 1038] (Kraemer). Careful and thorough. Includes brief etymologies of words and historical notes about persons. Takes its place worthily by the side of Muller's 'Grieksch Woordenboek.'

EPIGRAPHY, PALAEOGRAPHY, PAPYROLOGY.—S. Möller, *Griechische Papyri aus dem Berliner Museum* [Göteborg, 1929. Pp. viii+95, and 2 plates] (K. F. W. Schmidt). Thirteen hitherto unpublished papyri carefully edited with detailed commentary.—N. S. N. Valmin, *Inscriptions de la Messénie* [Lund, 1929. Pp. 48, and 4 plates] (Hiller v. Gaertringen). Recommended both for variety of texts and excellent plates.—E. K. Rand, *Studies in the Script of Tours. I. A survey of the MSS. of Tours* [Cambridge, Mass., 1929, the Mediaeval Academy of America. Vol. I, Text, Pp. xxi + 245; Vol. II., Pp. 16 and 200 plates] (Lehmann). Remarkable achievement. R. has made a magnificent and largely successful attempt in dealing with Tours to describe in full a leading school of writing of the Carolingian age.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

\*.\* Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Abstracts of Dissertations approved for the Ph.D., M.Sc. and M. Litt. Degrees in the University of Cambridge for the academical year 1928-29. Pp. 95. Cambridge: University Press, 1930. Paper.

*Arctos*. Acta Historica Philologica Philologica Fennica. Vol. I, Fasc. 1-2, pp. 1-40. M. Hammarström: Die antiken Buchstabennamen. Helsingfors, 1930. Paper.

Beckmann (F.) *Geographie und Ethnographie in Caesars Bellum Gallicum*. Pp. 192. Dortmund: Ruhfus, 1930. Paper.

Beeson (C. H.) *Lupus of Ferrières as Scribe and Text Critic*. A Study of his Autograph Copy of Cicero's *De oratore*. With a Facsimile of the Manuscript. Pp. xi + 51 + 218. (The Mediaeval Academy of America. Publication No. 4.) Cambridge, Mass.: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1930. Cloth, \$12.

*Bibliothek Warburg*. Vorträge. 1926-1927. Pp. xi + 248; 92 plates. 1927-1928. Pp. ix + 341; 42 plates. Leipzig: Teubner, 1930. Paper, RM. 25 and 20.

Billson (C. J.) *Πυρράδων Ἑρμηνεία*, Pindar's Odes of Victory. The Nemean and Isthmian Odes, with an introduction and a translation into English verse by C. J. B.: embellished with wood-engravings by J. Farleigh. Pp. xxiv +

193. Oxford: Blackwell, 1930. Cloth and boards, 73s. 6d. net.

*Bimillennium Vergilianum*. A Vergilian Exhibition. Held at the New York Public Library. List of books and manuscripts, with an introductory essay by C. Knapp. Pp. 40; illustrations. New York: Public Library, 1930. Paper.

Bonner (R. J.) and Smith (G.) *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*. Vol. I. Pp. ix + 390. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1930. Cloth, 18s. net.

Bornecque (H.) *Ovide. Les Amours. Remèdes à l'Amour*. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930. Paper, 18 and 10 fr. respectively.

Bornecque (H.) et Courbaud (E.) *Cicéron. De l'Orateur*. Livre troisième. Texte établi par H. B. et traduit par E.C. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1930. Paper, 20 fr.

Brinton (A. C.) *Maphaeus Vegius and his Thirteenth Book of the Aeneid*. A Chapter on Virgil in the Renaissance. Pp. xi + 183; illustrations. California: Stanford University Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 35s. net.

- Brix-Niemeyer.* Ausgewählte Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus. Erklärt von B.-N. Zweites Bändchen. Captivi. 7. Auflage bearbeitet von O. Köhler. Pp. 108. Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1930. Paper, RM. 3.60 (bound, 4.20).
- Butler* (A. J.) Sport in Classic Times. Pp. xi + 213; illustrations. London: Ernest Benn, 1930. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Byzantinische Zeitschrift.* Dreissigster Band. Pp. xiii + 681; 1 portrait, XVI plates, 40 illustrations. Festgabe A. Heisenberg zum 60. Geburtstage gewidmet. Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1929-30. Paper, RM. 50.
- Calderini* (A.) Aquileia Romana. Ricerche di storia e di epigrafia. Pp. cxxxvi + 594. (Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Serie quinta, Volume X.) Milan: 'Vita e Pensiero', 1930. Paper, L. 75.
- Castiglioni* (L.) Lucio Anneo Seneca. Della tranquillità dell'anima. Della brevità della vita. Testo critico e versione. Pp. xxxix + 154. Turin etc.: Paravia, 1930. Paper, L. 21.
- Cesareo* (E.) P. Terenzio Afro. Il Punitor di se stesso (Heautontimorumenos). Traduzione di E.C. Pp. xvi + 119. (Le Commedie di Terenzio tradotte col testo a fronte.) Turin etc.: Paravia, 1930. Paper, L. 8.50.
- Corbett* (P. E.) The Roman Law of Marriage. Pp. xii + 254. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Corinth.* Results of excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. IV, Part II. Terracotta lamps. By O. Broneer. Pp. x + 340; 210 figures, XXXIII plates. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press, 1930. Cloth. \$5.
- Coulon* (V.) et *Van Daele* (H.) Aristophane. Tome V. L'Assemblée des Femmes. Ploutos. Texte établi par V.C. et traduit par H.V.D. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1930. Paper, 30 fr.
- D'Agostino* (V.) Q. Orazio Flacco. Le Satire. Col commento del Dott. V. D'A. Edizione integra: pp. xxxii + 323. Edizione per le Scuole: pp. xxxii + 303. Milan etc.: Soc. Anon. Ed. Dante Alighieri, 1930. Paper, L. 20 and 16.
- Dalmeyda* (G.) Andocide. Discours. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1930. Paper, 25 fr.
- Davidis* (J. A.) De Orosio et Sancto Augustino Priscillianistarum adversariis commentatio historica et philologica. Pp. 301. The Hague: A. N. Govers N.V. Paper.
- Dottin* (G.) Les Argonautiques d'Orphée. Texte établi et traduit. (Nouvelle Collection de Textes et Documents.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1930. Paper, 50 fr.
- Drabkin* (J. E.) The Copa. An Investigation of the Problem of Date and Authorship with Notes on Some Passages of the Poem. Pp. vii + 107. Geneva (New York): The W. F. Humphrey Press, 1930. Paper.
- Düring* (I.) Die Harmonielehre des Klaudios Ptolemaios. Herausgegeben von I.D. Pp. civ + 147. (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift XXXVI. 1930: 1.) Göteborg: Wettergren och Kerber, 1930. Paper, 10 kr.
- Duthie* (A.) A Primer of Greek History. Pp. 143; illustrations and maps. London: Harrap, 1930. Cloth, 2s.
- Fraser* (Sir J. G.) The Growth of Plato's Ideal Theory. An essay. Pp. xi + 114. London: Macmillan, 1930. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Frutiger* (P.) Les Mythes de Platon. Étude philosophique et littéraire. Pp. 295. Paris: Alcan, 1930. Paper, 35 fr.
- Funaioli* (G.) Eseggesi Virgiliana Antica. Prolegomeni alla edizione del commento di Giunio Filargirio e di Tito Gallo. Pp. 509. (Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Serie quarta, Volume IX.) Milan: 'Vita e Pensiero', 1930. Paper, L. 35.
- Hamer* (E.) The Metres of English Poetry. Pp. xi + 340. London: Methuen, 1930. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Harder* (R.) Plotini Schriften, übersetzt von R.H. Band 1: Die Schriften 1-21 der chronologischen Reihenfolge. Pp. xi + 198. Leipzig: Meiner, 1930. Paper, RM. 12 (bound, 13.50).
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.* Vol. XL. Pp. 207. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1929. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Heitland* (W. E.) Repetita. An unwilling restatement of views on the subject of the Roman municipalities. Pp. 32. Cambridge: University Press, 1930. Paper, 2s. net.
- Hermathena.* No. XLV. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, and Co. (London: Longmans), 1930. Paper, 6s.
- Herrick* (M. T.) The Poetics of Aristotle in England. Pp. 196. (Cornell Studies in English, XVII.) New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1930. Paper, 8s. net.
- Herrmann* (L.) Les Masques et les Visages dans les Bucoliques de Virgile. Pp. 196. (Travaux de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Bruxelles. Tome I.) Brussels: 'La Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles', 1930. Paper.
- Hilka* (A.) und *Schumann* (O.) Carmina Burana. Mit Benutzung der Vorarbeiten W. Meyers kritisch herausgegeben. I. Band: Text. Pp. xvi + 112; 5 coloured plates. II. Band: Kommentar. Pp. 96 + 120. Heidelberg: Winter, 1930. Paper, M. 6 and 20.
- Hude* (C.) Xenophontis Historia Graeca. Recensuit C. H. Editio minor. Pp. 282. Leipzig: Teubner, 1930. Bound, RM. 3.20 (unbound, 2.40).
- Hyde* (R. W.) and *Weist* (E. C.) The Menaechmi of Plautus translated into English prose and verse for the performance of the play given by the Harvard Classical Club. Pp. 70. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1930. Stiff paper, 3s. 6d. net.
- Jeanmaire* (H.) Le Messianisme de Virgile. Pp. 217. Paris: J. Vrin, 1930. Paper.
- Johnstone* (M. A.) Etruria Past and Present. Pp. xv + 246; 40 illustrations and an end-paper map. London: Methuen, 1930. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Kappler* (W.) De memoria alterius libri Macabaeorum. Pp. 68. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1929. Paper.

- Kroll (W.)** Die Kosmologie des Plinius. Mit zwei Exkursen von H. Vogt. Pp. 92. (Abh. d. Schlesischen Gesellschaft für vaterländische Kultur. Geisteswissenschaftliche Reihe, 3. Heft.) Breslau: Marcus, 1930.
- Lamb (W.)** Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Great Britain: Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum. Pp. 54; XLVI plates. Oxford: University Press (London: Milford). Boards, 18s. net.
- Macnaghten (H.)** The Hundred Best Poems (Lyrical) in the Greek Language. Selected by H. M. Pp. xv+65. London and Glasgow: Gowans and Gray, 1930. Paper, 1s. (cloth, 2s.) net.
- Marra (G.)** Septimii Tertulliani de Cultu Feminarum libri duo. Recensuit J. M. Pp. xxxix+48. (Corpus Scr. Lat. Paravianum.) Turin etc.: Paravia, 1930. Paper, L. 9.
- Martin (J.)** M. Minucii Felicis Octavius. Recensuit J. M. Pp. 86. (Florilegium Patristicum, Fasc. VIII.) Bonn: Hanstein, 1930. Kartonierte, Mk. 3.60.
- Masqueray (P.)** Xenophon. Anabase. Tome I (Livres I-III). Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1930. Paper, 30 fr.
- Meillet (A.)** Aperçu d'une Histoire de la Langue grecque. 3<sup>e</sup> édition entièrement revue, corrigée et augmentée. Pp. xvi+326. Paris: Hachette, 1930.
- Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome.** Vol. VIII. Pp. 169; 57 plates. Rome: American Academy, 1930. Paper.
- Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua.** Vol. II. Meriamlik und Korykos. Aufnahmen von E. Herzfeld, mit einem begleitenden Text von S. Guyer. Pp. xvi+207. (Publications of the American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor. Vol. II.) Manchester: University Press, 1930. Cloth, 40s. net.
- Morgan (J. S.), McKensie (K.), Osgood (C. G.)** The Tradition of Virgil. Three Papers on the History and Influence of the Poet. Pp. 40; 8 plates. Princeton: University Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth and boards, 9s. net.
- Mountford (J. F.) and Schulz (J. T.)** Index Rerum et Nominum in Scholiis Servii et Aelii Donati Tractatorum. Pp. 205. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. XXIII.) Ithaca (N.Y.): Cornell University, 1930. Boards, \$3.
- Myres (J. L.)** Who were the Greeks? Pp. xxxvii+634; 21 maps and diagrams. (Sather Classical Lectures, Vol. 6.) Berkeley: University of California Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1930. Cloth, 3s. net.
- Nardi (B.)** The Youth of Virgil. Translated by B. P. Rand. With a preface by E. K. Rand. Pp. xii+139. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 7s. net.
- Nestle (W.)** Die Struktur des Eingangs in der Attischen Tragödie. Pp. x+133. (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 10. Heft.) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930. Paper, RM. 9.
- Neuburger (A.)** The Technical Arts and Sciences of the Ancients. Translated by H. L. Brose. Pp. xxxii+518; 676 figures. London: Methuen, 1930. Cloth, 42s. net.
- O'Neill (J. G.)** Ancient Corinth, with a topographical sketch of the Corinthia. Part I: From the earliest times to 404 B.C. Pp. xiii+270; X plates. (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 8.) Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 22s. 6d. net.
- Pallis (A.)** The  $\Sigma$  Rhapsody of the Iliad. Annotated by A. P. Pp. 107. London: Milford, 1930. Cloth.
- Powicke (F. M.)** Robert Grosseteste and the Nicomachean Ethics. Pp. 22. From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XVI. London: Milford. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.
- Rand (E. K.)** In Quest of Virgil's Birthplace. Pp. xvii+170; 126 illustrations, 3 maps. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 11s. 6d. net.
- Rehm (W.)** Der Untergang Roms im abend-ländischen Denken. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichtsschreibung und zum Dekadenproblem. Pp. viii+176. (Das Erbe der Alten, Heft XVIII.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1930. Paper, M. 6.50 (bound, 8).
- Reinach (T.) et Blum (L.)** Flavius Josephus. Contre Apion. Texte établi et annoté par T. R. et traduit par L. B. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1930. Paper, 38 fr.
- Rollo (W.)** Archivum Historicum Romanum. Pp. viii+234. London: University of London Press, 1930. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Rushforth (G. McN.)** Latin Historical Inscriptions illustrating the History of the Early Empire. Second edition. Pp. xxxii+144. London: Milford, 1934. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Sanders (H. A.)** Beati in Apocalypsin Libri Duodecim. Edited by H. A. S. Pp. xxiv+657; IV plates. (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. VII.) Rome: American Academy, 1930. Cloth, L. 65.
- Schilling (H.)** Das Ethos der Mesotes. Eine Studie zur Nikomachischen Ethik des Aristoteles. Pp. iv+103. (Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur Philosophie und ihrer Geschichte, 22.) Tübingen: Mohr, 1930. Paper, M. 6.
- Schroeder (O.)** Grundriss der griechischen Versgeschichte. Pp. 171. (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften, 7.) Heidelberg: Winter, 1930. Paper, M. 6 (bound, 7.50).
- Schuster (M.)** Tibull-studien. Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik Tibulls und des Corpus Tibullianum. Pp. vii+203. Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1930. Paper, M. 7.50.
- Scullard (H. H.)** Scipio Africanus in the Second Punic War. Pp. xv+331; 3 plates, 8 plans, 2 maps. Cambridge: University Press, 1930. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Séchan (L.)** La Danse grecque antique. Pp. 371; 70 figures, XIX plates. Paris: de Boccard, 1930. Paper, 50 fr.
- Servien (P.)** Les rythmes comme introduction physique à l'esthétique. Pp. 208. (Bibliothèque

- de la Revue des Cours et Conférences.) Paris: Boivin, 1930. Paper, 12 fr.
- Sir Edward Maunde Thompson. 1840-1929. Pp. 16. From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XV. London: Milford. Paper, 1s. net.
- Smith (R.) The Original Iliad. The Solution of the Homeric Question. Pp. 1-36, 63-95, 1-VIII, 100-140. From the author (12 Rue de France, Nice). Cloth and boards.
- Solmsen (F.), Fraenkel (E.) Inscriptiones Graecae ad inlustrandas dialectos selectae. Scholarum in usum edidit F. S. Editionem quartam auctam et emendatam curavit E. F. Pp. viii + 114. Leipzig: Teubner, 1930. Bound, RM. 4.80 (unbound, 4).
- Soyter (G.) Byzantinische Dichtung. Ausgewählte Texte mit Einleitung, kritischem Apparat und Kommentar. Pp. xii + 68. (Kommentierte Gr. u. Lat. Texte, 6.) Heidelberg: Winter, 1930. Paper, M. 3.
- Spindler (R.) Robert Browning und die Antike. Pp. 371 + 382. (Englische Bibliothek, 6 Band.) Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1930. Paper, M. 50.
- Stegemann (V.) Astrologie und Universalgeschichte. Studien und Interpretationen zu den Dionysiaka des Nonnos von Panopolis. Mit einer Sternkarte. Pp. viii + 257. (ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ, Heft IX.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1930. Cloth, RM. 18 (unbound, 16).
- Supplément critique au Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé. Revue des publications étrangères relatives à la philologie classique. Tome I (1929). Pp. 190. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1929. Paper.
- Tarn (W. W.) Seleucid-Parthian Studies. Pp. 33. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XVI.) London: Milford. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Taylor (A. E.) Plato and the Authorship of the 'Epinomis'. Pp. 85. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XV.) London: Milford. Paper, 7s. 6d. net.
- The Beacon. Virgilian Edition. April, 1930. Fordham Preparatory School, New York City.
- The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies. Vol. XX. M. A. Martin: The Use of Indirect Discourse in the Works of St. Ambrose. Pp. xviii + 165. \$3.50. Vol. XXI. M. B. O'Brien: Titles of Address in Christian Latin Epistolography. Pp. xv + 173. \$3.50. Vol. XXII. Burns (M. A.) St. John Chrysostom's Homilies on the Statues: A Study of their Rhetorical Qualities and Form. Pp. viii + 123. \$3.50. Vol. XXIII. Sullivan (T.) S. Aureli Augustini . . . de Doctrina Christiana liber quartus: a Commentary, with a Revised Text, Introduction, and Translation. Pp. xiv + 205. \$3.50. Vol. XXIV. M. D. Madden: The Pagan Divinities and their Worship as Depicted in the Works of Saint Augustine Exclusive of the City of God. Pp. x + 135. \$3.00. Vol. XXV. M. G. Murphy: St. Basil and Monasticism. Pp. xi + 112. \$3.50. Vol. XXVI. G. W. P. Hoey: The use of the optative mood in the works of St. Gregory of Nyssa. Pp. xviii + 129. 1930. \$3.50.
- Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1930. Paper.
- The Oxford Book of Greek Verse. Chosen by G. Murray, etc. With an Introduction by C. M. Bowra. Pp. xlviii + 608. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 8s. 6d. (India paper, 10s.) net.
- Thomsen (H.) Pleonasmus bei Plautus und Terentius. I. Ausgewählte zeitliche (und verwandte) Begriffe. Pp. xxii + 206. Uppsala: Almqvist och Wiksell. Paper.
- Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association. Vol. LX. 1929.
- Treble (H. A.) and King (K. M.) Everyday Life in Rome in the Time of Caesar and Cicero. Pp. 160; illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Tzenoff (G.) Die Abstammung der Bulgaren und die Urheimat der Slaven. Eine historisch-philologische Untersuchung über die Geschichte der alten Thrakoiyllirier, Skythen, Goten, Hunnen, Kelten u.a. Pp. xi + 358. Berlin and Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1930. Paper, RM. 22.
- Ursing (U.) Studien zur griechischen Fabel. Pp. ix + 111. Lund: Håken Ohlssons Buchdruckerei, 1930. Paper.
- Vellay (C.) Les nouveaux aspects de la question de Troie. Pp. 135; 1 map. (Collection d'Etudes Anciennes.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1930. Paper.
- Vollmer (F.) Poetae Latini Minores. Post Aem. Bachrens iterum recensuit F. V. Volumen I: Appendix Vergiliana. Exemplar anastatice iteratum curavit adnotationis supplemento auxit denuo emendavit W. Morel. Pp. xv + 209. Leipzig: Teubner, 1930. Bound, RM. 5.60 (unbound, 4.60).
- Walde (A.) Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Dritte neu bearbeitete Auflage von J. B. Hofmann. Lieferung 1. Pp. 80. Heidelberg: Winter, 1930. Paper, M. 1.50.
- Wellmann (M.) Der Physiologus. Eine religionsgeschichtlich-naturwissenschaftliche Untersuchung. Pp. 116. (Philologus, Supplementband XXII, Heft I.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1930. Paper, M. 8.50 (bound, 10.50).
- Westermann (W. L.) Upon Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt. Pp. 69. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1929. Cloth, 18s. 6d. net.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (U. von) My Recollections. 1848-1914. Translated by G. C. Richards. Pp. xi + 412; 3 portraits. London: Chatto and Windus, 1930. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Wili (W.) Vergil. Pp. iv + 148. Munich: Beck, 1930. Cloth, M. 6.50 (unbound, 4.50).
- Winbolt (S. E.) and Herbert (G.) The Roman Villa at Bignor, Sussex. With a Plan of the Villa. New edition. Pp. 18. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1930. Paper, 1s. net.
- Wyllie (T. H. S.) The Chancellor's Prize for Latin Verse Composition, 1930. Cornelium Gallum Laudat Vergilius. Pp. 12. Oxford: Blackwell. Paper, 2s. net.



University

chosen by  
tion by  
Oxford :  
, 1930.

us und  
ne (und  
Upp-

merican  
1929.  
veryday  
sar and  
Oxford :  
, 1930.

ulgaren  
ne his-  
ber die  
kythen,  
ri + 358.  
Paper,

Fabel.  
s Buch-

question  
llection  
Belles

. Post  
V. Vo-  
remplar  
ais sup-  
Morel.  
1930.

es Wör-  
nge von  
a. Hei-  
.50.

Eine  
aftliche  
s, Sup-  
g : Die-  
10.50).  
Ptole-  
olumbia  
, 1929.

Recol-  
G. C.  
Lon-  
Cloth,

Munich :  
nbound,

Roman  
of the  
xford :  
, 1930.

rize for  
rnelium  
Oxford :